arXiv:1611.02197v1 [math.GT] 7 Nov 2016

LIMIT SETS OF WEIL-PETERSSON GEODESICS

JEFFREY BROCK, CHRISTOPHER LEININGER, BABAK MODAMI, AND KASRA RAFI

Abstract. In this paper we investigate limit sets of Weil-Petersson geodesics in the Thurston compactification of Teichmüller space.

Contents

1. Introduction 1
2. Background 2
3. Sequences of curves on punctured spheres 9
4. Limits of closed geodesics 11
5. The nonuniquely ergodic case 19
6. The uniquely ergodic case 29
7. Appendix 29
References 38

1. Introduction

Given a surface S, let $\mathrm{Teich}(S)$ denote the Teichmüller space of hyperbolic metrics on S, and $\mathrm{Mod}(S)$ the mapping class group of S. Thurston compactified $\mathrm{Teich}(S)$ by adjoining the space of projective measured laminations $\mathcal{PML}(S)$, and used this in his classification of elements of $\mathrm{Mod}(S)$; [Thu88, FLP79]. On the other hand, $\mathrm{Teich}(S)$ has two important, $\mathrm{Mod}(S)$–invariant, unique-geodesic metrics, and hence has natural visual compactifications. These metrics have their own drawbacks—the Teichmüller metric is not negatively curved [Mas75] and Weil-Petersson metric is incomplete [Wol75]—and hence the standard results about visual compactification do not readily apply to any of these metrics. For example, the action $\mathrm{Mod}(S)$ does not extend continuously to the Teichmüller visual boundary [Ker80] nor the Weil-Petersson visual boundary [Bro05].

In [Mas82], Masur proved that the Thurston boundary and the Teichmüller visual boundary are not so different, proving that almost every Teichmüller

Date: November 8, 2016.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 32G15, Secondary 37D40.

The first author was partially supported by NSF gran DMS-1207572, the second author by NSF grant DMS-1510034, the third by NSF grant DMS-1065872, and the fourth author by NCERC grant # 435885.

ray converges to a point on the Thurston boundary (though positive dimensional families of rays based at a single point can converge to the same point). Lenzhen [Len08] constructed the first examples of Teichmüller geodesic rays that do not have any limit in the Thurston boundary, and recent constructions have illustrated increasingly exotic behavior [LLR, BLMR16, CMW, LMR16].

In this paper we begin an investigation into the behavior of how the Weil-Petersson visual compactification relates to Thurston's compactification. Specifically, we study the behavior of Weil-Petersson geodesic rays in the Thurston compactification. Our results are stated in terms of the *ending laminations* of Weil-Petersson rays introduced by Brock-Masur-Minsky in [BMM10]; see §2.7. The first theorem is a version of Masur's convergence for Teichmüller geodesics.

Theorem 1.1. *Suppose that the forward ending lamination of a Weil-Petersson geodesic ray is uniquely ergodic. Then the ray converges to the projective class of measures on the ending laminations in the Thurston compactification.*

On the other hand, we also prove that there are geodesic rays for which the ending lamination is nonuniquely ergodic, and whose limit sets are positive dimensional and in fact are non-simply connected.

Theorem 1.2. *There exist Weil-Petersson geodesic rays with nonuniquely ergodic forward ending laminations so that the limit sets in the Thurston compactification are topological circles.*

See Theorem 5.6 for a more precise statement.

Acknowledgment: The authors would like to thank Yair Minsky for useful conversations related to this work.

2. Background

2.1. **Surfaces and subsurfaces:** In this paper surfaces are connected, orientable and of finite type with boundaries or punctures. We denote a surface with genus g and b boundary curves or punctures by $S_{g,b}$ and define the complexity of the surface by $\xi(S_{g,b}) = 3g+b-3$. The main surfaces we consider always have only punctures, however we consider subsurfaces of the main surfaces with both punctures and boundary curves.

Notation 2.1. Our notation to compare quantities in this paper is as follows: Let $K \geq 1$ and $C \geq 0$. Given two functions $f, g : X \to \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$, we write $f \prec_{K,C} g$ if for any $x \in X$, $\frac{1}{K}g(x) - C \leq f(x) \leq Kg(x) + C$, $f \overset{+}{\prec}_C g$ if $g(x) - C \leq f(x) \leq g(x) + C$ and $f \overset{*}{\prec}_K g$ if $\frac{1}{K}g(x) \leq f(x) \leq Kg(x)$.

2.2. **Curves and laminations.**

Notation 2.2. Throughout this paper we refer by *curve* to the isotopy class of an essential simple closed curve, where a curve γ is *essential* if γ is not trivial or peripheral. A *multicurve* is a collection of curves with pair-wise distinct isotopy classes.

By the term *subsurface* of S, we refer to the isotopy class of an embedded essential subsurface, one whose boundary consists of essential curves and whose punctures agree with those of S.

We say that two curves α and β overlap and denote it by $\alpha \pitchfork \beta$ if the curves α and β can not be realized disjointly on the surface S. Two multicurves σ and f overlap if there are curves $\alpha \in \sigma$ and $\beta \in f$ which overlap.

A curve α and a subsurface $Y \subseteq S$ overlap and denote it by $\alpha \pitchfork Y$ if α can not be realized disjointly (up to homotopy). The overlap of a multicurve and a subsurface is defined similarly. We say that two subsurfaces Y and Z overlap and denote it by $Y \pitchfork Z$ if $\partial Y \pitchfork Z$ and $\partial Z \pitchfork Y$.

We refer the reader to [MM99, MM00] for the background about curve complex and subsurface projection maps. Denote the curve complex of a surface S by $\mathcal{C}(S)$ and the the set of vertices of the complex by $\mathcal{C}_0(S)$. The set $\mathcal{C}_0(S)$ is in fact the set of essential simple closed curves on S. For the background about pants and marking graphs and hierarchical structures and (hierarchy) resolution paths in pants and marking graphs we refer the reader to [MM00].

Let $Y \subseteq S$ be an essential subsurface. The *Y–subsurface projection coefficient* of two multicurves, markings or laminations μ, μ' is defined by

$$d_Y(\mu, \mu') := \operatorname{diam}_{\mathcal{C}(Y)}(\pi_Y(\mu) \cup \pi_Y(\mu')). \tag{2.1}$$

Here π_Y is the subsurface projection (coarse) map and $\operatorname{diam}_{\mathcal{C}(Y)}(\cdot)$ denotes the diameter of the given subset of $\mathcal{C}(Y)$. Our results are formulated in terms of subsurface coefficients which can be thought of as an analogue of continued fraction expansions which provide for a kind of symbolic coding for us.

We assume that the reader is familiar with basic facts about laminations and measured laminations on hyperbolic surfaces (see e.g. [PH92] for an introduction). We denote the space of measured laminations equipped with the weak* topology by $\mathcal{ML}(S)$ and the space of projective classes of measured laminations equipped with the quotient topology by $\mathcal{PML}(S)$.

Recall that a measurable lamination is *uniquely ergodic* if it supports one transverse measure up to rescale. Otherwise, the lamination is *nonuniquely ergodic*.

An important property of curve complexes is that they are Gromov hyperbolic [MM99]. By the result of Klarreich [Kla] the Gromov boundary of the curve complex is the quotient space of the space of projective measured laminations with minimal filling support by the measure forgetting

map equipped with the quotient topology. This space is called the *ending laminations space* and is denoted by $\mathcal{EL}(S)$.

In the sequel we recall some of the basic results in the context of curve complexes we need in this paper.

The Masur-Minsly distance formula [MM00] provides a coarse estimate for the distance of two pants decompositions in the pants graph. More precisely there exists a constant $M > 0$ depending on the topological type of S with the property that for any threshold $A \geq M$ there are constants $K \geq 1$ and $C \geq 0$ so that for any $P, Q \in P(S)$ we have

$$d(P,Q) \asymp_{K,C} \sum_{\substack{Y \subseteq S \\ \text{non-annular}}} \{d_Y(P,Q)\}_A \tag{2.2}$$

where the cut-off function is defined by $\{x\}_A = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } x \geq A \\ 0 & \text{if } x \leq A \end{cases}$.

The following theorem is a straightforward consequence of [MM00, Theorem 3.1]

Theorem 2.3. (Bounded geodesic image) *Given $K \geq 1$ and $C \geq 0$. Suppose that $\{\gamma_i\}_i$ is a sequence of curves which forms a $1-$Lipschitz $(K,C)-$quasi-geodesic in $\mathcal{C}(S)$. Further, suppose that for a subsurface $Y \subsetneq S$, $\gamma_i \pitchfork Y$ for all i. Then there is a constant $G > 0$ depending on k, c so that*

$$\operatorname{diam}_{\mathcal{C}(Y)}\left(\{\pi_Y(\gamma_i)\}_i\right) \leq G.$$

For the following inequality see [Beh06][Man13]

Theorem 2.4. (Behrstock inequality) *There exists a constant $B_0 > 0$ such that for any two subsurfaces $Y, Z \subsetneq S$ with $Y \pitchfork Z$ and a fixed marking or lamination μ we have that*

$$\min\left\{d_Y(\partial Z, \mu), d_Z(\partial Y, \mu)\right\} \leq B_0.$$

2.3. **Twist parameter.** We define the twist parameter of a curve δ about γ at a point X in Teichmüller space by

$$\operatorname{tw}_\gamma(\delta, X) := d_\gamma(\mu, \delta) \tag{2.3}$$

where μ is a Bers marking at X. Note that for a filling set of bounded length curves Γ at X, $\operatorname{tw}_\gamma(\delta, X) \stackrel{+}{\asymp} \operatorname{diam}_{\mathcal{C}(\gamma)}(\Gamma \cup \delta)$.

2.4. **The Thurston compactification.** Recall that a point in the Teichmüller space $\operatorname{Teich}(S)$ is a *marked complete hyperbolic surface* $[f\colon S \to X]$. Given a curve α, the hyperbolic length of α at $[f\colon S \to X]$ is defined to be hyperbolic length of the geodesic homotopic to $f(\alpha)$ in X. Abusing notation and denoting the point in $\operatorname{Teich}(S)$ by X, we write the hyperbolic length simply as $\ell_\alpha(X)$. The hyperbolic length function extends to a continuous function

$$\ell_{(\cdot)}(\cdot)\colon \operatorname{Teich}(S) \times \mathcal{ML}(S) \to \mathbb{R}.$$

Let ν be a measurable lamination and $\bar{\nu}$ a measured lamination with support ν. Moreover, denote the projective class of $\bar{\nu}$ by $[\bar{\nu}]$. The Thurston compactification, $\widehat{\mathrm{Teich}(S)} = \mathrm{Teich}(S) \cup \mathcal{PML}(S)$ is constructed so that a sequence $\{X_n\}_n \subseteq \mathrm{Teich}(S)$ converges to $[\bar{\nu}] \in \mathcal{PML}(S)$ if and only if

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\ell_\alpha(X_n)}{\ell_\beta(X_n)} = \frac{\mathrm{i}(\bar{\nu},\alpha)}{\mathrm{i}(\bar{\nu},\beta)}$$

for all simple closed curves α, β with $\mathrm{i}(\bar{\nu},\beta) \neq 0$. Here and throughout this paper the bi-homogenous function $\mathrm{i}(\cdot,\cdot)$ denotes the geometric intersection number of two curves and its extension to the space of measured laminations $\mathcal{ML}(S)$. See [Bon01, FLP79] for more details on the intersection function and Thurston compactification.

2.5. **Sequences of curves.** In [LLR] and [BLMR16] the authors studied infinite sequences of curves on a surface that limit to nonuniquely ergodic laminations. The novelty in this work is that local estimates on subsurface projections and intersection numbers could be promoted to global estimates on these quantities. We require minor modifications of some of the key results from [BLMR16] so as to be applicable to the sequences of curves on punctured spheres described in §3. We sketch the proofs of these results in the Appendix for completeness.

Definition 2.5. Fix positive integers $m \leq \xi(S)$ and $b' \geq b > 0$, and a sequence $\mathcal{E} = \{e_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$. We say that a sequence of curves $\{\gamma_k\}_k$ satisfies $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ if the following hold:

(i) Any m consecutive curves are pairwise disjoint,
(ii) any consecutive $2m$ curves fill S, and
(iii) for all $k \geq m$, $\gamma_{k+m} = D_{\gamma_k}^{e_k}(\gamma'_{k+m})$, where γ'_{k+m} is a curve such that

$$\mathrm{i}(\gamma'_{k+m}, \gamma_j) \begin{cases} \leq b' & \text{for } j = k-m, \dots, k+m-1 \\ = b & \text{for } j = k, k-1 \\ = 0 & \text{for } j = k+1, \dots, k+m-1 \end{cases}$$

Remark 2.6. The only real difference between this definition and the one given in our previous paper [BLMR16] is that this one requires fewer of the intersection numbers to be nonzero.

For the remainder of this subsection, we will assume that $\Gamma = \{\gamma_k\}_k$ satisfies $\mathcal{P}$ for some m, b, b' and $\mathcal{E} = \{e_k\}_k$ (see §3 for explicit examples). Furthermore, we assume there exists $a \geq 1$ such that $e_{k+1} \geq a e_k$ for all $k \geq 0$.

The first result describes the behavior of $\{\gamma_k\}_k$ in the curve complex of S and its subsurfaces. Let $\mathbb{M}$ be the monoid generated by m and $m+1$.

Theorem 2.7. *There exists $E, K, C > 0$ such that if $e_0 \geq E$, then $\{\gamma_k\}_k$ is a 1–Lipschitz (K,C)–quasi-geodesic. In particular, there exists an ending lamination ν such that any accumulation point of $\{\gamma_k\}_k$ in $\mathcal{PML}(S)$ is supported on ν.*

Furthermore, there exists $R > 0$, and for any marking μ, $R(\mu) > 0$, so that for $i < k < j$, with $k - i, j - k \in \mathbb{M}$, we have $\gamma_i \pitchfork \gamma_k$, $\gamma_k \pitchfork \gamma_k$, and

$$d_{\gamma_k}(\gamma_i, \gamma_j), d_{\gamma_k}(\gamma_i, \nu) \stackrel{+}{\asymp}_R e_i \quad \text{and} \quad d_{\gamma_k}(\mu, \gamma_j), d_{\gamma_k}(\mu, \nu) \stackrel{+}{\asymp}_{R(\mu)} e_i. \tag{2.4}$$

For any $i < j$ and W, not an annulus with core curve γ_k, for some k

$$d_W(\gamma_i, \gamma_j), d_W(\gamma_i, \nu) \leq R \quad \text{and} \quad d_W(\mu, \gamma_j), d_W(\mu, \nu) \leq R(\mu) \tag{2.5}$$

The next result provides estimates on intersection numbers for curves in our sequence. To describe the estimates, for all $i < k$, set the integers

$$A(i, k) := \prod_{\substack{i+m \leq j < k, \\ j \equiv h \mod m}} b e_j \tag{2.6}$$

where the product is taken to be 1 whenever the index set is empty.

Theorem 2.8. *If $a > 1$ is sufficiently large and $e_{k+1} \geq a e_k$, then there exists $\kappa_0 \geq 1$ such that $i(\gamma_i, \gamma_k) \leq \kappa_0 A(i, k)$ for all $i < k$, and*

$$i(\gamma_i, \gamma_k) \stackrel{*}{\asymp}_{\kappa_0} A(i, k). \tag{2.7}$$

if $k - i \geq 2m$ and $i \equiv k \mod m$, or if $i \leq 2m - 1$ and $k - i \geq m^2 + m - 1$.

For any curve δ, there exists $\kappa(\delta) \geq 1$ such that for all k sufficiently large

$$i(\delta, \gamma_k) \stackrel{*}{\asymp}_{\kappa(\delta)} A(0, k). \tag{2.8}$$

For reference, we record the following simple fact (see [BLMR16, Lemma 5.6]).

Lemma 2.9. *Suppose $\mathcal{E} = \{e_k\}_k$ satisfies $e_k \geq a e_{k-1}$ for all k and some $a > 1$. Then whenever $k < l$, we have*

$$\frac{A(i, k)}{A(i, l)} \leq a^{1 - \lfloor \frac{l-i}{m} \rfloor}.$$

The final result tells us that $\{\gamma_k\}_k$ splits into m subsequences, each projectively converging to a distinct ergodic measure on ν.

Theorem 2.10. *If $\{\gamma_k\}_k$ is as in Theorems 2.7 and 2.8, and ν is the corresponding lamination, then ν supports m ergodic measures, $\bar{\nu}^0, \ldots, \bar{\nu}^{m-1}$, given by*

$$\lim_{i \to \infty} \frac{\gamma_{h+im}}{A(0, h + im)} = \bar{\nu}^h,$$

for each $h = 0, \ldots, m - 1$.

2.6. **Weil-Petrsson metric.** The Weil-Petersson (WP) metric is an incomplete, mapping class group invariant, Riemannian metric with negative curvature on the Teichmüller space. The WP completion of Teichmüller space $\overline{\mathrm{Teich}(S)}$ is a stratified CAT(0) space. Each stratum is canonically isometric to the product of Teichmüller spaces of lower complexity, each equipped with the WP metric. More precisely, for any multicurve σ on S (collection of curves with pair-wise distinct isotopy classes) the stratum $\mathcal{S}(\sigma)$ consists of nodal Riemann surfaces with nodes at the curves in σ which in

turn is the product of the strata of connected components of the surface $S\backslash\sigma$. An important property of completion strata is the non-refraction property

Theorem 2.11. (Non-refraction; [Wol10][DW03]) *The interior of the geodesic segment connecting a point $X \in \mathcal{S}(\sigma)$ to a point $Y \in \mathcal{S}(\sigma')$ lies in the stratum $\mathcal{S}(\sigma \cap \sigma')$.*

Let $L_S > 0$ be the *Bers constant* of S (see [Bus10, §5]). Given a point in $\mathrm{Teich}(S)$ a pants decomposition P with the property that the length of all of the curves of P are at most L_S is called a *Bers pants decomposition*. Moreover, a marking whose base is a Bers pants decomposition and has transversal curves with shortest possible length is called a *Bers marking*. Brock [Bro03] showed that the coarse map

$$Q : \mathrm{Teich}(S) \to P(S) \tag{2.9}$$

which assigns to a point in the Teichmüller space a Bers pants decomposition is a quasi-isometry.

Using the Non-refraction property of completion strata Wolpert [Wol03] gives a picture for the limit of sequences of bounded length WP geodesic segments in Teichmüller space after remarkings. The following strengthening of the picture was proved in [Mod15, §4]. For reference, given a multicurve σ let $\mathrm{tw}(\sigma) < \mathrm{Mod}(S)$ denote the subgroup generated by Dehn twists about the curves in σ.

Theorem 2.12. (Geodesic Limit) *Given $T > 0$, let $\zeta_n : [0, T] \to \mathrm{Teich}(S)$ be a sequence of geodesic segments. After possibly passing to a subsequence, there are multicurves σ_l, $l = 0, \ldots, k+1$, a multicurve $\hat{\tau}$ with $\hat{\tau} = \sigma_l \cap \sigma_{l+1}$ for $l = 0, \ldots, k$ and a piece-wise geodesic segment*

$$\hat{\zeta} : [0, T] \to \overline{\mathrm{Teich}(S)}$$

such that

$$\hat{\zeta}(t_l) \in \mathcal{S}(\sigma_l) \quad \textit{for each} \quad l = 0, \ldots, k+1,$$

$$\hat{\zeta}((t_l, t_{l+1})) \subset \mathcal{S}(\hat{\tau}) \quad \textit{for each} \quad l = 0, \ldots, k,$$

and there exist elements $\psi_n \in \mathrm{Mod}(S)$ which are either trivial or unbounded and elements $\mathcal{T}_{l,n} \in \mathrm{tw}(\sigma_l - \hat{\tau})$ such that for any $\gamma \in \sigma_l - \hat{\tau}$ the power of the positive Dehn twist D_γ about γ is unbounded, and we have:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \psi_n(t) = \hat{\zeta}(t)$$

for any $t \in [0, t_1]$, and for any $l = 1, \ldots, k$ if

$$\varphi_{l,n} = \mathcal{T}_{l,n} \circ \ldots \circ \mathcal{T}_{1,n} \circ \psi_n, \tag{2.10}$$

then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \varphi_{l,n}(\zeta_n(t)) = \hat{\zeta}(t)$$

for any $t \in [t_l, t_{l+1}]$.

In [Mod15] controls on length-functions along WP geodesics in terms of subsurface coefficients are developed. The following are corollaries 4.10 and 4.11 in [Mod15]. Here we denote a Bers marking at a point $X \in \mathrm{Teich}(S)$ by $\mu(X)$.

Theorem 2.13. *Given T, ϵ_0 and $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$ positive, there is an $N \in \mathbb{N}$ with the following property. Let $\zeta : [0, T'] \to \mathrm{Teich}(S)$ be a WP geodesic segment of length $T' \leq T$ such that*

$$\sup_{t \in [0,T']} \ell_\gamma(\zeta(t)) \geq \epsilon_0.$$

If $d_\gamma(\mu(\zeta(0)), \mu(\zeta(T'))) > N$, then

$$\inf_{t \in [0,T']} \ell_\gamma(\zeta(t)) \leq \epsilon.$$

Theorem 2.14. *Given ϵ_0, T, s positive with $T > 2s$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$, there is an $\epsilon < \epsilon_0$ with the following property. Let $\zeta : [0, T'] \to \mathrm{Teich}(S)$ be a WP geodesic segment parametrized by arc-length of length $T' \in [2s, T]$. Let $J \subseteq [s, T' - s]$ be a subinterval. Suppose that for some $\gamma \in \mathcal{C}_0(S)$ we have*

$$\sup_{t \in [0,T']} \ell_\gamma(\zeta(t)) \geq \epsilon_0.$$

If $\inf_{t \in J} \ell_\gamma(\zeta(t)) \leq \epsilon$, then

$$d_\gamma(\mu(\zeta(0)), \mu(\zeta(T'))) > N.$$

Moreover, $N \to \infty$ as $\epsilon \to 0$.

2.7. **Ending laminations.** Brock, Masur and Minsky [BMM10] introduced the notion of *ending laminations* for Weil-Petersson geodesic rays: Let $r : [0, b) \to \mathrm{Teich}(S)$ be a complete WP geodesic ray. First the weak* limit of an infinite sequence of weighted distinct Bers curves at times $t_i \to b$ is an *ending measure* of the ray r. Moreover, any curve α with $\lim_{t \to b} \ell_\alpha(r(t_i)) = 0$ is a pinching curve of r. Now the union of supports of ending measures and pinching curves of r is the ending lamination of r which we denote by $\nu(r)$.

2.8. **Bounded combinatorics.** Given $R > 0$, a pair of (partial) markings or laminations (μ, ν) has *$R-$bounded combinatorics* if for any proper subsurface $Y \subsetneq S$ the bound

$$d_Y(\mu, \nu) \leq R$$

holds. If the bound holds only for non-annular subsurfaces of S we say that the pair has *non-annular $R-$bounded combinatorics*.

Theorem 2.15. ([BM15]) *Let r be a Weil-Petersson geodesic ray so that its end invariant has non-annular $R-$bounded combinatorics for some $R > 0$. Then the ray is recurrent to a compact subset of the moduli space.*

2.9. **Isolated annular subsurfaces.** In this section we recall the relevant aspects of the notion of an isolated annular subsurface along a hierarchy path [Mod15] and its consequence for our purposes in this paper.

As in §2.5, let $\Gamma = \{\gamma_k\}_k$ be a sequence of curves satisfying conditions $\mathcal{P}$ in Definition 2.5 for some m, b, b' and let $\mathcal{E} = \{e_k\}_k$ be a sequence of integers with growth condition $e_{k+1} \geq ae_k$ for some $a \geq 1$ and all $k \geq 0$. Further, let ν be the lamination determined by the sequence.

For an initial marking μ then by Theorem 2.7 there is an $R > 0$ so that the pair (μ, ν) has non-annular $R-$bounded combinatorics. This implies that any hierarchy path ϱ with end points (μ, ν) is stable in the pants graph of S; see [BMM11],[Mod15]. In particular, the image of a WP geodesic g with end invariant (μ, ν) under Brock's quasi-isometry (2.9) fellow travels ϱ. According to [Mod15, Definition 6.3] this implies that any curve with length less than the Bers constant at a point $g(t)$ is isolated along ϱ. In this situation we also say that γ is isolated at time t. Now by [Mod15, Lemma 6.4] we have

Lemma 2.16. (Annular coefficient comparison) *There are positive constants $\mathbf{w}, b$ and B depending on R and a constant L depending only on the topological type of S so that for a curve γ isolated at time t, any parameter p of ϱ corresponding to t, any $s \geq \mathbf{w}$ and $s' \overset{+}{\asymp}_b s$,*

$$d_\gamma(\mu(g(t-s')), \mu(g(t+s')) \overset{+}{\asymp}_B d_\gamma(\varrho(p-s), \varrho(p+s)). \tag{2.11}$$

where $\mu(\cdot)$ is a choice of Bers marking at the point. Furthermore,

$$\min\{\ell_\gamma(g(t-s')), \ell_\gamma(g(t+s'))\} \geq L. \tag{2.12}$$

3. Sequences of curves on punctured spheres

In this section we construct a sequence of curves that satisfies the condition $\mathcal{P}$ of Definition 2.5. This construction is a generalization of the one in [LLR] to spheres with more punctures. Fix a sequence of positive integers $\mathcal{E} = \{e_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$.

Let $p \geq 5$ be an odd integer and $S = S_{0,p}$ be a sphere with p punctures. We visualize S as the double of a regular p-gon (with vertices removed), admitting an order p "rotational" symmetry, as in Figure 1. Let $\rho\colon S \to S$ be the counterclockwise rotation by angle $4\pi/p$. Set $m = \frac{p-1}{2}$.

Next, let γ_0 be a curve obtained by doubling an arc connecting two sides of the polygon adjacent to a common side. Then $\{\rho^j(\gamma_0)\}_{j=0}^{p-1}$ is a set of p curves that pairwise intersection 0 or 2 times; see Figure 1. We let $\alpha = \rho^m(\gamma_0)$, D_α denote the (left) Dehn twist about the curve α, and for $k \geq 1$, set

$$\phi_k = D_\alpha^{e_{k+m-1}}\rho,$$

and

$$\Phi_k = \phi_1\phi_2\cdots\phi_k,$$

(in particular, $\Phi_0 = id$).

Define a sequence of curves $\Gamma = \Gamma(\mathcal{E}) = \{\gamma_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$, starting with γ_0, by the formula

$$\gamma_k = \Phi_k(\gamma_0).$$

Since a twist in α has no effect on a curve disjoint from it, for $0 \leq j \leq 2m-1$,

$$\gamma_k = \Phi_{k-j}(\gamma_j) = \Phi_{k-m}(\alpha). \tag{3.1}$$



FIGURE 1. $S_{0,7}$ as a double of a 7–gon. The curves $\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3 = \alpha, \gamma_4, \gamma_5$ and $\gamma_6' = \rho(\gamma_5)$ are shown.

Proposition 3.1. *The sequence $\Gamma(\mathcal{E}) = \{\gamma_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ satisfies condition $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ in Definition 2.5 for $m = \frac{p-1}{2}$ and $b' = b = 2$.*



FIGURE 2. For $S_{0,7}$ and any $k \geq 3$, applying Φ_{k-3} to any seven consecutive curves in the sequence, $\gamma_{k-3}, \ldots, \gamma_{k+3}$, gives $\gamma_0, \ldots, \gamma_5, \gamma_6^{(k)} = \Phi_{k-3}(\gamma_{k+3})$ as shown here.

Proof. The proof boils down to showing that, after applying an appropriate homeomorphism, any $2m+1 = p$ consecutive curves differ from $\gamma_0, \ldots, \gamma_{2m}$ only in the amount of relative twisting of γ_0 and γ_{2m} around γ_m; see Figure 2

and compare with the construction from [LLR]. We now explain this in more detail.

First, observe that for $j = 1, \dots, p-2 = 2m-1$, $\mathrm{i}(\alpha, \rho^j(\gamma_0)) = 0$. Thus

$$\gamma_j = \rho^j(\gamma_0),$$

for $j = 0, \dots, 2m-1$. By construction, any two of these curves intersect 0 or 2 times, while the first m are pairwise disjoint. Furthermore, the entire set of $2m$ curves fills S; see Figure 1.

Next, for any $k \geq m$, applying Φ_{k-m}^{-1} to the $2m-1$ consecutive curves $\{\gamma_{k-m}, \dots, \gamma_{k+m-1}\}$, (3.1) implies

$$\Phi_{k-m}^{-1}(\gamma_{k-m+j}) = \gamma_j \tag{3.2}$$

for each $j = 0, \dots, 2m-1$. Since k was arbitrary, it follows that any m consecutive curves are pairwise disjoint, and any $2m$ consecutive fill S. Thus, conditions (i) and (ii) of $\mathcal{P}$ are satisfied.

For part (iii), let $\gamma'_{k+m} = \Phi_{k-m}(\rho(\gamma_{2m-1})) = \Phi_{k-m}(\rho^{2m}(\gamma_0))$. Then, for $j = 0, \dots, 2m-1$, we may apply Φ_{k-m}^{-1}, and we have

$$\mathrm{i}(\gamma'_{k+m}, \gamma_{k-m+j}) = \mathrm{i}(\rho^{2m}(\gamma_0), \gamma_j) = \mathrm{i}(\rho^{2m}(\gamma_0), \rho^j(\gamma_0)) = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{for } j = m, \\ & \text{and } m-1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

which implies the intersection number requirement for (iii), with $b' = b = 2$.

Finally, applying Φ_{k-m} to γ_{k+m} we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{k-m}^{-1}(\gamma_{k+m}) &= \phi_{k-m+1} \cdots \phi_{k+m}(\gamma_0) = \phi_{k-m+1}(\rho^{2m-1}(\gamma_0)) \\ &= D_\alpha^{e_{(k-m+1)+m-1}} \rho(\rho^{2m-1}(\gamma_0)) = D_{\gamma_m}^{e_k}(\rho^{p-1}(\gamma_0)), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that $\alpha = \rho^m(\gamma_0) = \gamma_m$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{k+m} &= \Phi_{k-m}(D_{\gamma_m}^{e_k}(\rho^{p-1}(\gamma_0)) \\ &= \Phi_{k-m} D_{\gamma_m}^{e_k} \Phi_{k-m}^{-1} \Phi_{k-m} \rho^{p-1}(\gamma_0) \\ &= D_{\Phi_{k-m}(\gamma_m)}^{e_k}(\gamma'_{k+m}) = D_{\gamma'_k}^{e_k}(\gamma'_{k+m}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, part (iii) from $\mathcal{P}$ is also satisfied. □

Corollary 3.2. *If $\mathcal{E} = \{e_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ has $e_{k+1} \geq a e_k$ for all k and for $a > 1$ sufficiently large, then the conclusions of Theorem 2.7, Theorem 2.8 and Theorem 2.10 hold for the sequence $\Gamma(\mathcal{E}) = \{\gamma_k\}_{k=0}^\infty$. In particular, the sequence determines a nonuniquely ergodic lamination ν.*

4. Limits of closed geodesics

Let α, ρ be as in Section 3, e be a positive integer, and $f_e = D_\alpha^e \rho$. To relate this to the previous section, note that for any fixed e, the sequence of mapping classes $\{\phi_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ obtained from the constant sequence $\mathcal{E} = \{e\}_{k=1}^\infty$, is constant; $\phi_k = f_e$ for all k. Consequently, the sequence of curves $\Gamma(\mathcal{E})$ is obtained by iteration: $\Gamma(\mathcal{E}) = \{f_e^k(\alpha)\}$ (after a shift of indices).

We assume in what follows that $e > E$ from Theorem 2.7. Then by Proposition 3.1 and Theorem 2.7, $k \mapsto f_e^k(\alpha)$ is a f_e–invariant quasi-geodesic in the curve complex, and hence f_e is pseudo-Anosov. A key tool in our construction of a Weil-Petersson geodesic ray will be a very precise understanding of the limiting behavior of the axes of the pseudo-Anosov mapping classes f_e, as e tends to infinity.

Our analysis of the axes for f_e begins with an analysis of the action of ρ on $\mathrm{Teich}(S)$ and certain strata in the Weil-Petersson completion. Observe that the quotient of S by $\langle\rho\rangle$ is a sphere with one puncture and two cone points. A fixed point of ρ in $\mathrm{Teich}(S)$ is a ρ–invariant conformal structure on S, or equivalently, a conformal structure obtained by pulling back a conformal structure on the quotient $S/\langle\rho\rangle$. Since the sphere with three marked points is rigid, there is a unique such conformal structure, and hence exactly one fixed point $Z \in \mathrm{Teich}(S)$.

Proposition 4.1. *For any stratum $\mathcal{S}(v)$ defined by a multicurve v, there exists a point $X_0 \in \overline{\mathcal{S}(v)}$ so that*

$$d_{\mathrm{WP}}(X_0, \rho(X_0)) = \inf_{Y \in \mathcal{S}(v)} d_{\mathrm{WP}}(Y, \rho(Y)).$$

To restate the proposition, we define a function

$$F : \overline{\mathrm{Teich}(S)} \to \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0},$$

by $F(X) = d_{\mathrm{WP}}(X, \rho(X))$. The proposition is then equivalent to showing that the restriction of F to the closure $\overline{\mathcal{S}(v)}$ attains a minimum value. We begin with a lemma.

Lemma 4.2. *The function $F : \overline{\mathrm{Teich}(S)} \to \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ is convex, 2–Lipschitz, and for any $R > 0$, $F^{-1}([0, R])$ is a bounded set.*

Proof. Since the completion of the Weil-Petersson metric is CAT(0), the distance function on $\overline{\mathrm{Teich}(S)}$ is convex, and hence so is F. The triangle inequality proves that F is 2–Lipschitz, since

$$\begin{aligned} |F(Y) - F(X)| &= |d_{\mathrm{WP}}(Y, \rho(Y)) - d_{\mathrm{WP}}(X, \rho(X))| \\ &\leq d_{\mathrm{WP}}(X, Y) + d_{\mathrm{WP}}(\rho(X), \rho(Y)) \\ &= 2d_{\mathrm{WP}}(X, Y). \end{aligned}$$

Suppose $R_0 > 0$ is sufficiently small so that $B_{R_0}(Z)$, the closed ball of radius R_0 in $\overline{\mathrm{Teich}(S)}$ about the fixed point $Z \in \mathrm{Teich}(S)$, is contained in $\mathrm{Teich}(S)$, and is thus compact. Let $R_1 > 0$ be the minimum value of F on $\partial B_{R_0}(Z)$.

For any $Y \in \overline{\mathrm{Teich}(S)} - B_{R_0}(Z)$, let Y_0 be the unique point of intersection of the geodesic from Z to Y with the sphere $\partial B_{R_0}(Z)$. Then it follows that $d_{\mathrm{WP}}(Y, Z) = R_0 + d_{\mathrm{WP}}(Y, Y_0)$, and so convexity of F implies

$$F(Y_0) \leq \frac{R_0}{d_{\mathrm{WP}}(Y, Z)} F(Y) + \frac{d_{\mathrm{WP}}(Y, Y_0)}{d_{\mathrm{WP}}(Y, Z)} F(Z)$$

But then since $F(Z) = 0$ and $F(Y_0) \geq R_1$ we have

$$F(Y) \geq \frac{d_{WP}(Z,Y)}{R_0} F(Y_0) \geq \frac{d_{WP}(Z,Y)}{R_0} R_1.$$

Rearranging the above inequality, we have

$$d_{WP}(Z,Y) \leq \frac{R_0}{R_1} F(Y)$$

and hence if $R > R_0$ and $F(Y) \leq R$, then we have $d_{\mathrm{WP}}(Z,Y) \leq \frac{R_0 R}{R_1}$. That is, $F^{-1}([0,R]) \subset B_{R_0 R/R_1}(Z)$, as required. □

Proof of Proposition 4.1. Any stratum in $\overline{\mathcal{S}(v)}$ has the form $\mathcal{S}(v')$ for a multicurve v' containing v. Observe that the infimum on any stratum $\mathcal{S}(v')$ in $\overline{\mathcal{S}(v)}$ is no less than the infimum on $\mathcal{S}(v)$. Let $\mathcal{S}(v')$ in $\overline{\mathcal{S}(v)}$ be a stratum in the closure having minimal dimension, so that the infimum of F on $\mathcal{S}(v')$ is equal to the infimum on $\mathcal{S}(v)$. It suffices to show that the infimum of F on $\mathcal{S}(v')$ is realized on $\mathcal{S}(v')$.

Let $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \subset \mathcal{S}(v')$ be an *infimizing sequence* for F on $\mathcal{S}(v')$; that is

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} F(X_n) = \inf_{X \in \mathcal{S}(v')} F(X). \tag{4.1}$$

Let $R < \infty$ be such that $F(X_n) \leq R$ for all $n \geq 1$. Lemma 4.2 then implies that there exists $D > 0$ such that $d_{\mathrm{WP}}(Z, X_n) \leq D$ for all $n \geq 1$.

By the triangle inequality, the length of the geodesic segments $[X_1, X_n]$ are bounded by $2D$. Let $S_1, \ldots, S_m$ be the connected component of $S \backslash v$. Then $\mathcal{S}(v')$ is isometric to $\prod_{j=1}^m \mathrm{Teich}(S_j)$ with the product of WP metrics on each factor. Let $\zeta_n : [0, T_n'] \to \prod_{j=1}^m \mathrm{Teich}(S_j)$ be the parametrization of $[X_1, X_n]$ by arc-length. Let

$$\mathrm{pr}_j : \prod_{j=1}^m \mathrm{Teich}(S_j) \to \mathrm{Teich}(S_j)$$

be the projection to the j-the factor and let $\zeta_n^j : [0, T_n^j] \to \mathrm{Teich}(S_j)$ be parametrization by arc-length of $\mathrm{pr}_j \circ \zeta_n$. Note that $T_n^j \leq 2D$ for $j = 1, \ldots, m$. So for a fixed j we may apply Theorem 2.12 (Geodesic Limit Theorem) to the sequence of geodesic segments ζ_n^j inside $\mathrm{Teich}(S_j)$. Let the multicurves σ_i^j, $i = 0, \ldots, k_j+1$, the multicurve $\hat{\tau}^j$, the partition $t_0^j < \ldots < t_{k_j+1}^j$ and the piece-wise geodesic $\hat{\zeta}^j$ be as in the theorem. Also let the elements of mapping class group ψ_n^j and $\varphi_{l,n}^j$, $l = 1, \ldots, k_j$ be as in the theorem. Note that by the theorem when $k_j \geq 1$ we have that $\hat{\zeta}^j(t_1^j) \in \mathcal{S}(\sigma_1^j)$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} \varphi_{1,n}^j(\zeta_n^j(t_1^j)) = \hat{\zeta}^j(t_1^j)$.

Since the geodesics ζ_n^j have a common point $\mathrm{pr}_j(X_1)$, it follows that ψ_n^j is the identity for all n. If $k_j = 0$, then after possibly passing to a subsequence the points $\mathrm{pr}_j(X_n)$ converge.

First suppose that $k_j = 0$ for all $j = 1, \dots, m$, then after possible passing to a subsequence all sequences $\mathrm{pr}_j(X_n)$ converge. As a result the points X_n converge and we are done.

Now we suppose that $k_j \geq 1$ for some j, let $\beta \in \sigma_1^j$, and we derive a contradiction. Note that $\mathrm{pr}_j(X_1)$ and $\mathrm{pr}_j(X_n)$ are in $\mathrm{Teich}(S_j)$. Claim 4.9 in the proof of Theorem 4.6 in [Mod15] tells us that for Bers markings $\mu(\mathrm{pr}_j(X_1))$ and $\mu(\mathrm{pr}_j(X_n))$ and curves $\beta_n = (\varphi_{1,n}^j)^{-1}(\beta)$,

$$d_{\beta_n}\Big(\mu(\mathrm{pr}_j(X_1)), \mu(\mathrm{pr}_j(X_n))\Big) \to \infty.$$

as $n \to \infty$.

Now recall that $\varphi_{1,n}^j = \mathcal{T}_{1,n}^j \circ \psi_n^j$, also that $\mathcal{T}_{1,n}^j$ is the composition of a power of the Dehn twist about the curve β_n and powers of Dehn twists about curves disjoint from β_n. Moreover, as we saw above ψ_n is identity. Thus $\beta_n \equiv \beta$ for all n. Therefore we have

$$d_{\beta}\Big(\mu(\mathrm{pr}_j(X_1)), \mu(\mathrm{pr}_j(X_n))\Big) \to \infty$$

as $n \to \infty$. We may then choose a sequence $\{n_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ so that

$$d_{\beta}\Big(\mu(\mathrm{pr}_j(X_{n_k})), \mu(\mathrm{pr}_j(X_{n_{k+1}}))\Big) \to \infty \tag{4.2}$$

as $k \to \infty$.

Claim 4.3. There exists a sequence of points $\{Y_{n_k}\}_k$ on the geodesic segments $[X_{n_k}, X_{n_{k+1}}]$ with the property that the distance between Y_{n_k} and $\mathcal{S}(v' \cup \beta)$ goes to 0.

Proof. It suffices to show that there is a sequence of points Y_{n_k} on $[X_{n_k}, X_{n_{k+1}}]$ so that the distance between $\mathrm{pr}_j(Y_{n_k})$ and $\mathcal{S}(\beta) \subset \overline{\mathrm{Teich}(S_j)}$ goes to 0. If the distance between $\mathrm{pr}_j(X_{n_k})$ and $\mathcal{S}(\beta)$ goes to 0, the sequence $Y_{n_k} = X_{n_k}$ is the desired sequence. Otherwise, there is a lower bound for the distance between $\mathrm{pr}_j(X_{n_k})$ and $\mathcal{S}(\beta)$. Moreover, by [Wol08, Corollary 4.10] we have

$$d_{\mathrm{WP}}(\mathrm{pr}_j(X_{n_k}), \mathcal{S}(\beta)) \leq \sqrt{2\pi \ell_\beta(\mathrm{pr}_j(X_{n_k}))}.$$

Thus we obtain a lower bound for $\ell_\beta(\mathrm{pr}_j(X_{n_k}))$. Appealing to Theorem 2.13, the annular coefficient limit (4.2) provides a point $Y_{n_k}^j$ on $[\mathrm{pr}_j(X_{n_k}), \mathrm{pr}_j(X_{n_{k+1}})]$ so that the distance between $Y_{n_k}^j$ and $\mathcal{S}(\beta)$ goes to 0. Now the points Y_{n_k} on $[X_{n_k}, X_{n_{k+1}}]$ with $\mathrm{pr}_j(Y_{n_k}) = Y_{n_k}^j$ are the desired points. □

It follows from the above claim and the convexity of the function F that

$$F(Y_{n_k}) \leq \min\{F(X_{n_k}), F(X_{n_{k+1}})\}. \tag{4.3}$$

Therefore, $\{Y_{n_k}\}$ is also an infinimizing sequence for the function F. Let Y_k' be the closest point to Y_{n_k} in $\mathcal{S}(v' \cup \beta)$. Since the distance of the points Y_{n_k} and $\mathcal{S}(v' \cup \beta)$ goes to 0 we have that

$$d_{\mathrm{WP}}(Y_{n_k}, Y_k') \to 0$$

and therefore $F(Y_{n_k})$ and $F(Y'_n)$ have the same limit since F is 2–Lipschitz. Therefore $\{Y'_k\}_k$ is a minimizing sequence for the function F in the stratum $\mathcal{S}(v' \cup \beta)$, but this has dimension less than that of $\mathcal{S}(v')$, a contradiction. □

Let g_e denote the axis for f_e (see [DW03]), and $\hat{g}_e$ the image closed geodesic in the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_{0,n}$.

Proposition 4.4. *There is a geodesic segment $\omega \subset \overline{\mathrm{Teich}(S)}$ with the property that*

$$g_e^\omega = \cdots f_e^{-2}(\omega) \cup f_e^{-1}(\omega) \cup \omega \cup f_e(\omega) \cup f_e^2(\omega) \cdots$$

defines a biinfinite path that fellow travels g_e, and as $e \to \infty$, the Hausdorff distance between g_e^ω and g_e tends to 0.

For the proof of this proposition, we will need the following lemma telling us about the short curves along the axes of f_e.

Lemma 4.5. *The minimal lengths of the curves $\{f_e^k(\alpha)\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ along g_e tend to zero as $e \to \infty$. Furthermore, there exists $\epsilon > 0$ so that for all $e > E$ and every point of g_e, at most one curve on S has length less than ϵ, and such a curve must be in the set $\{f_e^k(\alpha)\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$.*

Consequently, for all e, g_e must return to the ϵ–thick part infinitely often.

Proof. The mapping class group elements f_e are pseudo-Anosov maps with a uniform bound for the non-annular subsurface coefficients independent of e. This follows from the fact that in Theorem 2.7 the upper bound R depends only on the parameters from Definition 2.5 and the initial marking μ which is the same for all f_e.

Claim 4.6. There exists an $\bar{\epsilon} > 0$ depending only on R, so that the length of each curve $\gamma \notin \{f_e^k(\alpha)\}_k$ is bounded below by $\bar{\epsilon}$ along g.

Suppose that at time t the length of γ is less that the Bers constant. Then the curve γ is isolated at time t along g_e the axis of f_e in the Teichmüller space; for the discussion about isolated annular subsurfaces see §2.9. Then by (2.12) in Lemma 2.16, there are constants $\mathbf{w}, b$ depending only on R and a constant L such that for any $s > \mathbf{w}$ and $s' \overset{+}{\asymp}_b s$ we have

$$\min\{\ell_\gamma(g_e(t - s')), \ell_\gamma(g_e(t + s'))\} > L.$$

Then by [Mod15, Corollary 3.5] there exists a number $u > 0$, depending only on L, so that

$$\ell_\gamma(g_e(t)) > L/2$$

for all $t \in [t - s', t - s' + u] \cup [t + s' - u, t + s']$. Let $J = [t - s' + u, t + s' - u]$. Then we have that

$$\sup_{t\in[t-s',t+s']} \ell_\gamma(g_e(t) > L/2.$$

Moreover, for any integer $N > 0$, by Theorem 2.14, there is an $\epsilon > 0$ so that if

$$\inf_{t\in J} \ell_\gamma(g_e(t)) < \epsilon. \tag{4.4}$$

then

$$d_\gamma(\mu(g_e(t-s')), \mu(g_e(t+s')) > N \tag{4.5}$$

where $\mu(\cdot)$ denotes a Bers marking at the given point. Also by the theorem $N \to \infty$ as $\epsilon \to 0$. In particular, since $t \in J$, if

$$\ell_\gamma(g_e(t)) < \epsilon. \tag{4.6}$$

then (4.5) holds.

Let ϱ be the hierarchy path in $P(S)$ between μ and the stable lamination of the pseudo-Anosov map f_e. According to (2.11) in Lemma 2.16 there is a constant $B > 0$ depending only on R such that

$$d_\gamma(\mu(g_e(t-s')), \mu(g_e(t+s')) \stackrel{+}{\asymp}_B d_\gamma(\varrho(p-s), \varrho(p+s)) \tag{4.7}$$

where $p \pm s$ is the parameter so that $\varrho(p \pm s)$ is roughly a closet point to a Bers pants decomposition at $g_e(t \pm s')$.

Further, suppose that γ is not in the sequence $\{f_e^k(\alpha)\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$. Then the no back tracking property of the hierarchy path ϱ (see [MM00]) and the upper bound (2.5) from Theorem 2.7 give us an upper bound for the subsurface coefficient

$$d_\gamma(\varrho(p-s), \varrho(p+s))$$

depending only on R. So by (4.7) we have an upper bound for

$$d_\gamma(\mu(g(t-s')), \mu(g(t+s'))$$

depending only on R. On the other hand, as we saw in (4.5) by choosing $\ell_\gamma(g(t))$ arbitrary small, we can make

$$d_\gamma(\mu(g(t-s')), \mu(g(t+s'))$$

arbitrary large which contradicts the upper bound we just obtained. Therefore, there is a lower bound $\bar{\epsilon} > 0$ for the length of γ at time t which depends only on R. The claim then follows from the fact that the time t was arbitrary.

The length of any one of the curves in the sequence $\{f_e^k(\alpha)\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is strictly convex along g_e, and so has a unique minimum. The unique minimum for $f_e^k(\alpha)$ occurs at f_e^k–image of the point where α is minimized. Thus, we can parameterize g_e by arc-length so that for $t_e = \|f_e\|_{WP}$, $f_e^k(\alpha)$ has length minimized at $g_e(kt_e)$.

Because g_e has bounded non-annular combinatorics, independent of e, it recurs to a fixed thick part of Teich(S), independent of e, by Theorem 2.15. Let $t_e' \in (0, t_e)$ be a time for which $g_e(t_e')$ is in a fixed thick part. But then $g_e(kt_e + t_e')$ is in the thick part for all k. In particular, by convexity of the length of α, it follows that outside the interval $(-t_e + t_e', t_e')$, there is a uniform lower bound to the length of α. Likewise, the length of $f_e^k(\alpha)$ is uniformly bounded below outside the interval $((k-1)t_e + t_e', kt_e + t_e')$. Consequently, for $k \neq k'$ $f_e^k(\alpha)$ and $f_e^{k'}(\alpha)$ cannot simultaneously be short.

Since these are the only short curves, it follows that at all times kt_e there is a uniform lower bound to the lengths of all curves except $f_e^k(\alpha)$.

As we saw above $\ell_{f_e(\alpha)}(g_e(kt_e)) \to 0$ as $e \to \infty$, thus the distance from the point $g_e(kt_e)$ to the stratum $\mathcal{S}(f_e^k(\alpha))$, which by [Wol08, Corollary 4.10] is bounded above by $\sqrt{2\pi\ell_\alpha(g_e(kt_e))}$, tends to zero as well. □

We continue to use $t_e > 0$ to denote the translation length of f_e and assume the geodesic g_e is parameterized as in the proof. Likewise, $\{(k-1)t_e + t'_e\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ denotes times when g_e recurs to the fixed ϵ–thick part of Teich(S).

Appealing to Proposition 4.1, let $X_0 \in \overline{\mathcal{S}(\rho^{-1}(\alpha))}$ be a point where the function $F(X) = d_{WP}(X, \rho(X))$ is minimized in the closure of the stratum. Observe that on $\overline{\mathcal{S}(\rho^{-1}(\alpha))}$, we have $f_e = D_\alpha^e \rho = \rho$ since D_α^e acts trivially on $\rho(\overline{\mathcal{S}(\rho^{-1}(\alpha))}) = \overline{\mathcal{S}(\alpha)}$. Consequently, $f_e(X_0) = \rho(X_0)$, and we may concatenate the geodesic segment $\omega = [X_0, \rho(X_0)]$ with its f_e–translates to produces an f_e–invariant, bi-infinite path in $\overline{\text{Teich}(S)}$:

$$g_e^\omega = \cdots f_e^{-2}(\omega) \cup f_e^{-1}(\omega) \cup \omega \cup f_e(\omega) \cup f_e^2(\omega) \cdots$$

To prove the proposition, we will show that the Hausdorff distance between g_e and g_e^ω tends to zero as $e \to \infty$. For this, we first establish the following.

Lemma 4.7. *The translation distance t_e of f_e limits to $|\omega|$; that is,*

$$\lim_{e\to\infty} t_e = d_{\text{WP}}(X_0, \rho(X_0)) = |\omega|.$$

Proof. Let $Y_e \in \mathcal{S}(\rho^{-1}(\alpha))$ be the closest point to $g_e(-t_e)$ (and hence closest to the entire geodesic g_e). Since Y_e is also in $\mathcal{S}(\rho^{-1}(\alpha))$, $f_e(Y_e) = \rho(Y_e)$, and hence

$$d_{\text{WP}}(f_e(Y_e), Y_e) = d_{\text{WP}}(\rho(Y_e), Y_e) \geq d_{\text{WP}}(X_0, \rho(X_0)).$$

Because $d_{\text{WP}}(Y_e, g_e(-t_e)) = d_{\text{WP}}(f_e(Y_e), g_e(0)) \to 0$ as $e \to \infty$, it follows from the triangle inequality that

$$\liminf_{e\to\infty} d_{\text{WP}}(g_e(-t_e), g_e(0)) = \liminf_{e\to\infty} t_e \geq d_{\text{WP}}(X_0, \rho(X_0)).$$

Since g_e is the geodesic axis, t_e is less than the length f_e translates along g_e^ω, which is precisely $|\omega| = d_{\text{WP}}(X_0, \rho(X_0))$. That is, $t_e \leq d_{\text{WP}}(X_0, \rho(X_0))$, and hence

$$\limsup_{e\to\infty} t_e \leq d_{\text{WP}}(X_0, \rho(X_0)).$$

Combining this with the above, we have $\lim_{e\to\infty} t_e = d_{\text{WP}}(X_0, \rho(X_0))$, completing the proof of the lemma. □

We are ready for the

Proof of Proposition 4.4. We recall that g_e is a geodesic that intersects a fixed ϵ–thick part of Teich(S) at the times $(k-1)t_e + t'_e$, for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Denote the closest point on g_e^ω to the point $g_e((k-1)t_e + t'_e)$ by $X_{e,k}$. The distance between $X_{e,k}$ and $g_e((k-1)t_e + t'_e)$ must tend to zero as $e \to \infty$.

Otherwise, the strict negative curvature in the thick part of Teich(S) would imply a definite contraction factor $\delta < 1$ for the closest point projection to g_e restricted to g_e^ω for all e sufficiently large. This would imply

$$d_{\mathrm{WP}}(X_0, \rho(X_0)) = \lim_{e\to\infty} t_e \leq \delta d_{\mathrm{WP}}(X_0, \rho(X_0))$$

an obvious contradiction. The set of points $\{X_{e,k}\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is f_e–invariant and as $e \to \infty$, its distance to g_e tends to 0. Appealing to the CAT(0) property of $\overline{\mathrm{Teich}(S)}$, the furthest point of g_e^ω to g_e must also have distance tending to 0, and hence the Hausdorff distance between g_e and g_e^ω tends to 0. □

Corollary 4.8. *The point $X_0 \in \overline{\mathcal{S}(\rho^{-1}(\alpha))}$ where the minimum of the function $F(X) = d_{\mathrm{WP}}(X, \rho(X))$ (restricted to $\overline{\mathcal{S}(\rho^{-1}(\alpha))}$) lies in $\mathcal{S}(\rho^{-1}(\alpha))$. Moreover,*

$$\lim_{e\to\infty} g_e([-t_e, 0]) = \omega.$$

Proof. From Lemma 4.5, the only curves which are very short along g_e are the curves $\{f_e^k(\alpha)\}_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}$. The closest point along g_e to X_0 must be a point at which the length of $f_e^{-1}(\alpha) = \rho^{-1}(\alpha)$ is very short (since $\rho^{-1}(\alpha)$ has zero length at X_0), and the length of $\rho^{-1}(\alpha)$ at this point tends to zero as $e \to \infty$. Appealing to Lemma 4.5 again, we see that no other curve can have length less than ϵ at this point of g_e, and hence $X_0 \in \mathcal{S}(\rho^{-1}(\alpha))$.

From this we also see that $\rho(X_0) \in \mathcal{S}(\alpha)$, and so by the non-refraction of geodesics, Theorem 2.11, the interior of ω lies in Teich(S). Since g_e is closest to $\mathcal{S}(\rho^{-1}(\alpha))$ at the point $g_e(-t_e)$, it follows that $g_e(-t_e) \to X_0$ as $e \to \infty$. The limiting behavior of the geodesic follows from the CAT(0) property of the metric on $\overline{\mathrm{Teich}(S)}$. □

The geodesic axis g_e descends to a closed geodesic $\hat{g}_e$ in $\mathcal{M}_{0,n}$ and ω descends to a geodesic segment $\hat{\omega}$ in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,n}$. The previous corollary immediately implies the following.

Corollary 4.9. *As $e \to \infty$, we have convergence $\hat{g}_e \to \hat{\omega} \subset \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{0,n}$.*

For any $e > 0$, we let δ_e denote the geodesic segment from the midpoint of ω to the midpoint of $f_e(\omega)$. We also let ω^- and ω^+ denote the first and second half-segments of ω, respectively (so $\omega = \omega^- \cup \omega^+$ and $\omega^- \cap \omega^+$ is the midpoint of ω). Our construction in the next section will use the following.

Lemma 4.10. *Given $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $N > 0$ so that for all $e \geq N$, the triangle with sides δ_e, ω^+, and $f_e(\omega^-)$ has angles less than ϵ at the endpoints of δ_e, and the Hausdorff distance between δ_e and $\omega^+ \cup f_e(\omega^-)$ is at most ϵ.*

Proof. By Proposition 4.4 and Corollary 4.8, the segment $g_e([-\frac{t_e}{2}, \frac{t_e}{2}])$ can be made as close as we like to $\omega^+ \cup f_e(\omega^-)$. Since $g_e([-\frac{t_e}{2}, \frac{t_e}{2}])$ and δ_e are both geodesics in a CAT(0) space, and since their endpoints become closer and closer as e tends to infinity, it follows that the distance between $g_e([-\frac{t_e}{2}, \frac{t_e}{w}])$ and δ_e tends to zero as $e \to \infty$. Therefore, the distance between δ_e and $\omega^+ \cup f_e(\omega^-)$ tends to zero as $e \to \infty$. This proves the second claim.

Short initial segments of δ_e and ω^+ are both geodesics in a Riemannian manifold, they have a common initial point, and the initial segment of δ_e converges to that of ω^+ as $e \to \infty$. It follows that the angle between δ_e and ω^+ tends to zero as $e \to \infty$. A similar argument (composing with f_e^{-1}) shows that the angle at endpoint of δ_e and $f_e(\omega^-)$ tends to zero as $e \to \infty$. This completes the proof. □

5. The nonuniquely ergodic case

5.1. **Infinite geodesic ray.** Consider a sequence $\mathcal{E} = \{e_k\}_k$ with $e_0 > E$ and $e_{k+1} \geq ae_k$ for some $a > 1$ and all k, to which we will impose further constraints later. We write ϕ_k, $\Phi_k = \phi_1 \cdots \phi_{k-1}\phi_k$, and $\Gamma(\mathcal{E}) = \{\gamma_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ as in Section 3. Recall from (3.1) that $\gamma_k = \Phi_{k-m}(\alpha)$ for all $k \geq m$.

Let ω denote the Weil-Petersson geodesic segment connecting the point $X_0 \in \mathcal{S}(\rho^{-1}(\alpha))$ to $\rho(X_0) \in \mathcal{S}(\alpha)$ as in §4. Note that $X_0 \in \mathcal{S}(\rho^{-1}(\alpha))$ and so

$$\Phi_k(X_0) \in \mathcal{S}(\Phi_k(\rho^{-1}(\alpha))) = \mathcal{S}(\Phi_{k-1}(\alpha)) = \mathcal{S}(\gamma_{k+m-1}). \tag{5.1}$$

Write δ_k for the geodesic segment connecting midpoints of ω and $\phi_k(\omega)$ (compare §4 and Lemma 4.10). The endpoint of δ_k on ω will be called its initial endpoint, and the one on $\phi_k(\omega)$ its terminal. The image of δ_k under any mapping class will have its endpoints labelled as initial and terminal according to those of δ_k.

With this notation, we claim that the terminal endpoint of $\Phi_k(\delta_{k+1})$ is the same as the initial endpoint of $\Phi_{k+1}(\delta_{k+2})$. Indeed, applying Φ_k^{-1} to this pair of arcs, we have δ_{k+1} and $\phi_{k+1}(\delta_{k+2})$. The terminal endpoint of δ_{k+1} is the midpoint of $\phi_{k+1}(\omega)$. This is the ϕ_{k+1}–image of the midpoint of ω, which is also the ϕ_{k+1}–image of the initial endpoint of δ_{k+1}, as claimed.

Concatenating segments of this type defines a half-infinite path:

$$R_{\mathcal{E}} = \delta_1 \cup \Phi_1(\delta_2) \cup \Phi_2(\delta_3) \cup \Phi_3(\delta_4) \cup \cdots .$$

This path fellow-travels the concatenation of ω and its translates:

$$g_{\mathcal{E}}^{\omega} = \omega \cup \Phi_1(\omega) \cup \Phi_2(\omega) \cup \Phi_3(\omega) \cup \cdots .$$

By (5.1), projecting $R_{\mathcal{E}}$ and $g_{\mathcal{E}}^{\omega}$ to the curve complex (via the systole map) gives paths fellow traveling $\{\gamma_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$. By Proposition 3.1 and Theorem 2.7, it follows that these are quasi-geodesics in the curve complex. Since the projection to the curve complex is coarsely Lipschitz, so $R_{\mathcal{E}}$ and $g_{\mathcal{E}}^{\omega}$ are also quasi-geodesics.

We will also be interested in a truncation of $R_{\mathcal{E}}$ after k steps:

$$R_{\mathcal{E}}^k = \delta_1 \cup \Phi_1(\delta_2) \cup \cdots \cup \Phi_{k-1}(\delta_k),$$

and let r_k denote the geodesic segment connecting the initial and terminal point of the broken geodesic segment $R_{\mathcal{E}}^k$; see Figure 3.

The angle between consecutive segments $\Phi_{k-1}(\delta_k)$ and $\Phi_k(\delta_{k+1})$ will be denoted θ_k. Applying Φ_{k-1}, this is the same as the angle between δ_k and $\phi_k(\delta_{k+1})$. Observe that the angle θ_k is at least π minus the sum of the angle

between δ_k and $\phi_k(\omega)$ and $\phi_k(\delta_{k+1})$ and $\phi_k(\omega)$ (with appropriate directions chosen). Since $\phi_k = D_\alpha^{e_{k+m-1}} = f_{e_{k+m-1}}$, by taking e_{k+m-1} and e_{k+m} sufficiently large, appealing to Lemma 4.10 we can ensure that θ_k is as close to π as we like. In particular, we additionally assume that our sequence $\{e_k\}_k$ grows fast enough that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \pi - \theta_k < 1. \tag{5.2}$$

We can also (clearly) assume that the e_k are all large enough so that $\theta_k \geq \frac{\pi}{2}$ for all k.



FIGURE 3. The concatenation of segments defining $R_{\mathcal{E}}^k \subset R_{\mathcal{E}}$ and $g_{\mathcal{E}}^\omega$ together with the geodesic segment r_k connected the endpoints of $R_{\mathcal{E}}^k$.

Proposition 5.1. *As $k \to \infty$, r_k limits to a geodesic ray r, and all three of r, $R_{\mathcal{E}}$, and $g_{\mathcal{E}}^\omega$ are asymptotic (the distance tends to zero).*

Proof. According to the last part of Lemma 4.10, $R_{\mathcal{E}}$ and $g_{\mathcal{E}}^\omega$ are asymptotic. Therefore, it suffices to prove that r_k has a limit r, and that this is asymptotic to $R_{\mathcal{E}}$. Before proceeding, we note that $\Phi_k(X_0)$ lies in the stratum $\mathcal{S}(\Phi_k(\rho^{-1}(\alpha))) = \mathcal{S}(\Phi_{k-1}(\alpha)) = \mathcal{S}(\gamma_{k+m})$

Let $\{v_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$ denote the concatenation points of $R_{\mathcal{E}}$. Denote by P_k a ruled polygon bounded by r_k and $R_{\mathcal{E}}^k$. This polygon has as vertices $v_0, \ldots, v_k$. Let θ_i^k denote the interior angles of P_k at v_i, for $i = 0, \ldots, k$, and observe that for $0 < i < k$, we have $\theta_i \leq \theta_i^k$. In addition, there is a constant $c_0 < 0$ and $d_0 > 0$ so that the d_0–neighborhood of v_i in P_k has Gaussian curvature $K \leq c_0$. Consequently, for any $d < d_0$, if r_k is disjoint from the d–neighborhood $N_d(v_i)$ of v_i, then since $\theta_i^k \geq \frac{\pi}{2}$, $N_d(v_i) \cap P_k$ contains a quarter-sector of a disk of radius d centered at v_i in a surface of curvature at most c_0. Therefore, the integral of the curvature K over $N_d(v_i) \cap P_k$ satisfies

$$\int_{N_d(v_i)\cap P_k} K \, dA \leq \frac{c_0 \pi d^2}{4}.$$

By the Gauss-Bonnet Theorem, we have

$$\int_{P_k} K dA + \sum_{i=0}^{k} (\pi - \theta_i^k) = 2\pi$$

which implies

$$\theta_0^k + \theta_k^k - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1}(\pi - \theta_i^k) = \int_{P_k} K dA.$$

For any $d > 0$, let $i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_j$ denote those indices i for which $R_{\mathcal{E}}^k$ is more than d away from v_i. Then by our assumption on the angles θ_i we have

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_0^k + \theta_k^k - 1 \leq \theta_0^k + \theta_k^k - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1}(\pi - \theta_i^k) &= \int_{P_k} K dA \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell=1}^{j} \int_{N_{v_\ell} \cap P_k} K dA \leq \frac{j c_0 \pi d^2}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $c_0 < 0$, this implies

$$j \leq \frac{4(\theta_0^k + \theta_k^k - 1)}{c_0 \pi d^2} \leq \frac{4|1 - (\theta_0^k + \theta_k^k)|}{|c_0| \pi d^2} \leq \frac{4(1 + 2\pi)}{|c_0| \pi d^2}.$$

This bounds the number of vertices along $R_{\mathcal{E}}^k$ that can be further than d away from r_k by some number $J(d)$, which is independent of k. Therefore, for any $N > 0$ and $k, k' \geq N + 2J(d) + 1$, there is a vertex v_i of $R_{\mathcal{E}}$ with $N \leq i \leq \min\{k, k'\}$ so that r_k and $r_{k'}$ contain points x_k and $x_{k'}$, respectively, which are within distance d of v_i. Therefore, x_k and $x_{k'}$ are within distance $2d$ of each other. Since $R_{\mathcal{E}}$ is a quasi-geodesic, the distance from v_i to v_0 tends to infinity with i. Consequently, as N tends to infinity, the distance from x_k and $x_{k'}$ to v_0 also tends to infinity. By convexity of the distance function, it follows that for any $D > 0$, the initial segments of $\{r_k\}_k$ of length D form a Cauchy sequence in the topology of uniform convergence. By completeness of $\overline{\mathrm{Teich}(S)}$, these segments of length D converge. Letting D tend to infinity, it follows that r_k converges (locally uniformly) to a geodesic ray r.

For any $d > 0$, suppose v_i is a vertex of $R_{\mathcal{E}}$ further than $2d$ away from any point of r. For k sufficiently large, it follows that r_k is further than d from v_i. Since there are at most $J(d)$ of the latter indices i, it follows that r must come closer than $2d$ from all but $J(d)$ vertices. In particular, there exists $N(d)$ so that for all $i \geq N(d)$, r comes within $2d$ of v_i. Since the distance function is convex, it follows that the tail of $R_{\mathcal{E}}$ starting at $v_{N(d)}$ is within Hausdorff distance $2d$ from some tail of r. Since d was arbitrary, it follows that $R_{\mathcal{E}}$ and r are asymptotic, as required. □

5.2. **Curves along r.** The following is straightforward, but we record it as a convenient reference.

Lemma 5.2. *For any $k \geq m - 1$ the initial and terminal endpoints of $\Phi_{k-m+1}(\omega)$ are in $\mathcal{S}(\gamma_k)$ and $\mathcal{S}(\gamma_{k+1})$, respectively. Furthermore, for any compact subinterval of $I \subset int(\omega)$, the $2m$ consecutive curves*

$$\{\gamma_{k-m+1}, \ldots, \gamma_{k+m}\}$$

have bounded length on $\Phi_{k-m+1}(I)$, with the bound depending on the choice of interval I, but independent of k.

Proof. Recall that $\alpha = \rho^m(\gamma_0) = \rho(\gamma_{m-1})$, and hence $X_0 \in \mathcal{S}(\alpha) = \mathcal{S}(\gamma_{m-1})$. Consequently $\Phi_{k-m+1}(X_0) \in \mathcal{S}(\gamma_k)$, since $\Phi_{k-m+1}(\gamma_{m-1}) = \gamma_k$; see (3.2). Thus the initial endpoint of $\Phi_{k-m+1}(\omega)$ is in $\mathcal{S}(\gamma_k)$. Since the terminal endpoint of $\Phi_{k-m+1}(\omega)$ is the initial endpoint of $\Phi_{k-m+2}(\omega)$, this common endpoint lies in $\mathcal{S}(\gamma_{k+1})$, proving the first statement.

The compact subinterval $I \subset int(\omega)$ is entirely contained in Teichmüller space, and hence the curves $\gamma_0, \dots, \gamma_{2m-1}$ have bounded length in I. Since the Φ_{k-m+1}–image of these curves are precisely those listed in the lemma, the second statement also follows. □

Theorem 5.3. *There exists a sequence $\{t_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}$ which is eventually increasing, such that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \ell_{\gamma_k}(r(t_k)) = 0$. Furthermore, for any $\epsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, the set of curves with length less than ϵ along r is contained in $\{\gamma_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ and contains a tail of this sequence, $\{\gamma_k\}_{k\geq N}$, for some $N = N(\epsilon) \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

Proof. Since r is strongly asymptotic to $g_{\mathcal{E}}^{\omega}$ by Proposition 5.1 we may choose t_k so that

$$d_{\mathrm{WP}}(r(t_k), \mathcal{S}(\gamma_k)) \to 0$$

as $k \to \infty$. Then by the formula

$$d_{\mathrm{WP}}(r(t_k), \mathcal{S}(\gamma_k)) = \sqrt{2\pi \ell_{\gamma_k}(r(t_k))} + O\Big(\ell_{\gamma_k}(r(t_k)^{5/2})\Big)$$

from [Wol08, Corollary 4.8], where the constant of the O notation depend only on an upper bound for the length of γ_k at the point $r(t_k)$, we see

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \ell_{\gamma_k}(r(t_k)) = 0.$$

Since $g_{\mathcal{E}}$ passes through the strata $\{\mathcal{S}(\gamma_k)\}_k$ in order (i.e. $g_{\mathcal{E}}$ intersects $\mathcal{S}(\gamma_k)$ before $\mathcal{S}(\gamma_{k+1})$), the times when r comes close to $\{\mathcal{S}(\gamma_k)\}_k$ also occur in order. This proves the first statement.

For the second statement, we note that the first statement implies that for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $N(\epsilon) > 0$ so that for all $k \geq N(\epsilon)$, γ_k has length less than ϵ along r (in fact, at the point $r(t_k)$). On the other hand, by Lemma 5.2 $\Phi_{k-m+1}(\omega)$ goes from $\mathcal{S}(\gamma_k)$ to $\mathcal{S}(\gamma_{k+1})$, and no other curves become very short along $\Phi_{k-m+1}(\omega)$. Again appealing to the fact that r is asymptotic to $g_{\mathcal{E}}$, it follows that for k sufficiently short, the only curves of length less than ϵ on $r([t_k, t_{k+1}])$ are γ_k and γ_{k+1}. Therefore, for ϵ sufficiently small, the only curves that can have length less than ϵ along r are from $\{\gamma_k\}_k$. □

Because r is asymptotic to $g_{\mathcal{E}}$, there is a version of Lemma 5.2 for r. We will consider sequences $\{s_k\}_k \subset [0, \infty)$ satisfying one of the following:

(C1) There exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $t_k + \epsilon < s_k < t_{k+1} - \epsilon$, or
(C2) $\lim_{k\to\infty} |t_{k+1} - s_k| = 0$.

Corollary 5.4. *Suppose that $\{s_k\}_k \subset [0, \infty)$ is a sequence.*

- *If $\{s_k\}_k$ satisfies (C1), then the $2m$ consecutive curves $\gamma_{k-m+1}, \dots, \gamma_{k+m}$ have bounded length at $r(s_k)$, independent of k, but depending on ϵ.*
- *If $\{s_k\}_k$ satisfies (C2), then $\lim_{k\to\infty} \ell_{\gamma_{k+1}}(r(s_k)) = 0$, and the $2m-1$ consecutive curves $\gamma_{k-m+2}, \dots, \gamma_{k+m}$ have bounded length at $r(s_k)$, independent of k.*

Proof. Suppose we are in case (C1). Then there exists a compact interval $I \subset int(\omega)$ so that the Hausdorff distance between $\Phi_{k-m+1}(I)$ and $r([t_k + \epsilon, t_{k+1} - \epsilon])$ tends to zero as $k \to \infty$. By Lemma 5.2, $\gamma_{k-m+1}, \dots, \gamma_{k+m}$ have bounded length along $\Phi_{k-m+1}(I)$. Since $\Phi_{k-m+1}(I)$ remains bounded away from the completion strata of Teich(S), $\gamma_{k-m+1}, \dots, \gamma_{k+m}$ also have bounded length along $r([t_k + \epsilon, t_{k+1} - \epsilon])$, as required.

For case (C2), the assumptions imply that $d_{WP}(r(s_k), \mathcal{S}(\gamma_{k+1})) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$, and hence $\ell_{\gamma_{k+1}}(r(s_k)) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. The bound on the lengths of $\gamma_{k-m+2}, \dots, \gamma_{k+m}$ follows from case (C1) and convexity of the length functions. Indeed, from case (C1), we know that those curves have uniformly bounded lengths at $r(\frac{t_k+t_{k+1}}{2})$ and $r(\frac{t_{k+1}+t_{k+2}}{2})$, and hence all along $r([\frac{t_k+t_{k+1}}{2}, \frac{t_{k+1}+t_{k+2}}{2}])$. □

As another application of Theorem 5.3, we can identify the ending lamination of r.

Corollary 5.5. *The lamination ν is the ending lamination of the ray r.*

Proof. By Theorem 5.3, $\lim_{k\to\infty} \ell_{\gamma_k}(r(t_k)) = 0$. Since, by Theorem 2.10, the subsequence

$$\{\gamma_k \mid k \equiv 0 \bmod m\}$$

converges to $\bar{\nu}_0$ in $\mathcal{ML}(S)$ (after appropriately scaling), it follows that the ending lamination of r contains ν. On the other hand, $\nu \in \mathcal{EL}(S)$, and hence ν is the ending lamination of r. □

5.3. **Limit set.** Theorem 1.2 follows immediately from the following.

Theorem 5.6. *The limit set of r in $\mathcal{PML}(S)$ is the concatenation of the edges*

$$\left[[\bar{\nu}^0], [\bar{\nu}^1]\right], \dots, \left[[\bar{\nu}^{m-1}], [\bar{\nu}^0]\right]$$

in the $1-$skeleton of the simplex of projective measures supported on ν.

We will reduce this to a more technical statement, and then in the next subsection, prove that technical statement. As we will be exclusively interested in lengths of curves along r, for any curve δ and $s \in [0, \infty)$, we write

$$\ell_\delta(s) = \ell_\delta(r(s)).$$

Our main technical result is the following.

Theorem 5.7. *Suppose $\{s_k\}_k \subset [0, \infty)$ is a sequence.*

- *If $\{s_k\}_k$ satisfies (C1), then there exists $x_k > 0$ such that for any simple closed curve δ, we have*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{x_k i(\delta, \gamma_k)}{\ell_\delta(s_k)} = 1.$$

- *If $\{s_k\}_k$ satisfies (C2), then there exist $x_k, y_k \geq 0$ with $x_k + y_k \geq 0$ such that for any simple closed curve δ, we have*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{x_k i(\delta, \gamma_k) + y_k i(\delta, \gamma_{k+1})}{\ell_\delta(s_k)} = 1.$$

Proof of Theorem 5.6 assuming Theorem 5.7. We will pass to subsequences in what follows, and to avoid double subscripts, for a sequence $\{c_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$, we simply write $\{c_k\}_{k\in J}$, where J is the index set defining the subsequence. Likewise $\lim_{k\in J} c_k$ will denote the limit of the subsequence as the indices from J tend to infinity.

Now suppose that $[\bar\mu] \in \mathcal{PML}(S)$ is a limit point of the ray r. That is, for some sequence of times $\{s_j\}_j \subset [0,\infty)$ and any two curves δ, δ', we have

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} \frac{\ell_\delta(s_j)}{\ell_{\delta'}(s_j)} = \frac{\mathrm{i}(\delta, \bar\mu)}{\mathrm{i}(\delta', \bar\mu)}$$

(see §2.4). Since s_j must tend to infinity as $j \to \infty$, by passing to a subsequence, we may assume that the sequence is increasing, and there exists an increasing sequence $\{k_j\}_j$ such that either $|s_j - t_{k_j}| \to 0$ or else there exists $\epsilon > 0$ so that $t_{k_j} + \epsilon < s_j < t_{k_j+1} - \epsilon$. Consequently, after reindexing, we assume (as we may) that our sequence is a subsequence $\{s_k\}_{k\in J}$ of some sequence $\{s_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ satisfying either (C1) or (C2).

Suppose first that $\{s_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ satisfies (C1), and pass to further subsequence (with index set still denoted J for simplicity) so that all $k \in J$ are congruent to some $h \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$ mod m. Then by our assumption and Theorem 5.7 we have

$$\frac{\mathrm{i}(\delta, \bar\mu)}{\mathrm{i}(\delta', \bar\mu)} = \lim_{k\in J} \frac{\ell_\delta(s_k)}{\ell_{\delta'}(s_k)} = \lim_{k\in J} \frac{x_k \mathrm{i}(\delta, \gamma_k)}{x_k \mathrm{i}(\delta', \gamma_k)} = \frac{\mathrm{i}(\delta, \bar\nu^h)}{\mathrm{i}(\delta', \bar\nu^{h'})}$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that $[\gamma_k] \to [\bar\nu^h]$ in $\mathcal{PML}(S)$, for $k \in J$. But this implies that $[\bar\mu] = [\bar\nu^{(h)}]$ since δ, δ' were arbitrary.

We further observe that if $h \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$, then $\{s_k\}_k = \{\frac{t_k + t_{k+1}}{2}\}$ satisfies (C1), and the computations just given show that for any subsequence $\{s_k\}_{k\in J}$ such that $k \equiv h \bmod m$ for all $k \in J$, we have $\lim_{k\in J} r(s_k) = [\bar\nu^h]$. Consequently, all the vertices of the simplex are in fact accumulation points.

Next, suppose $\{s_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ satisfies (C2), and again pass to a further subsequence so that all $k \in J$ are congruent to some $h \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$ mod m. In this case, we must pass to an even further subsequence so that $[x_k\gamma_k + y_k\gamma_{k+1}]$ converges to some $[\bar\mu'] \in \mathcal{PML}(S)$, for $k \in J$. Note that $[\bar\mu'] \in [[\bar\nu^h], [\bar\nu^{h+1}]]$ since $[\gamma_k] \to [\bar\nu^h]$ and $[\gamma_{k+1}] \to [\bar\nu^{h+1}]$ (where we replace $h+1$ by 0, if

$h+1=m$). Then, by similar reasoning we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathrm{i}(\delta,\bar{\mu})}{\mathrm{i}(\delta',\bar{\mu})} &= \lim_{k\in J}\frac{\ell_\delta(s_k)}{\ell_{\delta'}(s_k)} = \lim_{k\in J}\frac{x_k\mathrm{i}(\delta,\gamma_k)+y_k\mathrm{i}(\delta,\gamma_{k+1})}{x_k\mathrm{i}(\delta',\gamma_k)+y_k\mathrm{i}(\delta',\gamma_{k+1})}\\ &= \lim_{k\in J}\frac{\mathrm{i}(\delta,x_k\gamma_k+y_k\gamma_{k+1})}{\mathrm{i}(\delta',x_k\gamma_k+y_k\gamma_{k+1})} = \frac{\mathrm{i}(\delta,\bar{\mu}')}{\mathrm{i}(\delta',\bar{\mu}')}.\end{aligned}$$

Here the second to last equality follows from bilinearity of intersection number, while the last equality follows since $[x_k\gamma_k+y_k\gamma_{k+1}]\to[\bar{\mu}']$ in $\mathcal{PML}(S)$, for $k\in J$. Thus again we see that $[\bar{\mu}]=[\bar{\mu}']$.

So, the limit set of r is contained in the required loop in the 1–skeleton of the simplex of projective classes of measures on ν. If we fix $h\in\{0,\dots,m-1\}$ and consider the arcs

$$\{r([\tfrac{t_k+t_{k+1}}{2},\tfrac{t_{k+1}+t_{k+2}}{2}])\mid k\equiv h \bmod m\}$$

it follows that the initial endpoints converge to $[\bar{\nu}^h]$ while the terminal endpoints converge to $[\bar{\nu}^{h+1}]$ (again replacing $h+1$ with 0 if $h+1=m$). On the other hand, the accumulation set of this sequence of arcs is a connected subset of $[[\bar{\nu}^h],[\bar{\nu}^{h+1}]]$. Any such set is necessarily the entire 1–simplex. Therefore, the ray r accumulate on the entire loop, as required. □

5.4. **Proof of Theorem 5.7.** Here we prove the required technical theorem used in the proof of Theorem 5.6. Throughout what follows, we assume that $\{s_k\}_k$ satisfies (C1) or (C2). Many of the estimates can be carried out for both cases simultaneously.

From Corollary 5.4, the $2m-1$ curves $\gamma_{k-m+2},\dots,\gamma_{k+m}$ have bounded lengths in $r(s_k)$, and since

$$\gamma_{k-m+2},\dots,\gamma_k,\gamma_{k+2},\dots,\gamma_{k+m}$$

fill $S-\gamma_{k+1}$, there is a pants decomposition P_k containing the m–component multicurve

$$\sigma_k=\gamma_k\cup\ldots\cup\gamma_{k+m-1}$$

such that $\ell_\alpha(s_k)$ is bounded for all $\alpha\in P_k$, independent of k (though the bounds depend on ϵ in case (C1)). Write $P_k^c=P_k\setminus\sigma_k$.

For an arbitrary curve δ and $\alpha\in P_k$, the *contribution to the length of* δ *from* α *in* $r(s_k)$ is defined by the equation:

$$\ell_\delta(s_k,\alpha):=\mathrm{i}(\delta,\alpha)(w_{s_k}(\alpha)+\mathrm{tw}_\alpha(\delta,s_k)\ell_\alpha(s_k)) \tag{5.3}$$

where $\mathrm{tw}_\alpha(\delta,s_k)$ is the twist of δ about α at $r(s_k)$ as is defined in (2.3), and $w_{s_k}(\alpha)$ is the width of the largest embedded tubular neighborhood of α in $r(t_k)$ (i.e. the minimal distance between boundary components of the neighborhood). By [Bus10, §4.1], we have

$$w_{s_k}(\alpha)=-2\log\left(\tfrac{1}{\ell_\alpha(s_k)}\right). \tag{5.4}$$

The following estimate on hyperbolic length from [CRS08, Lemmas 7.2, 7.3] will be our primary tool.

Theorem 5.8. *Suppose $\{s_k\}_k$ satisfies (C1) or (C2). Then*

$$\Big|\ell_\delta(s_k) - \sum_{\alpha\in P_k} \ell_\delta(s_k,\alpha)\Big| = O\Big(\sum_{\alpha\in P_k} i(\delta,\alpha)\Big) \tag{5.5}$$

Here the constant of the O notation depends only on the upper bound for the length of the curves in P_k.

The proof of Theorem 5.7 now follows by estimating the various terms in the sum from this theorem, and finding that one (in case (C1)) or two (in case (C2)) dominate not only the other terms, but also the error term on the right.

Recall that for any simple closed curve δ, Theorem 2.8 implies that for all j sufficiently large we have

$$\mathrm{i}(\delta,\gamma_j) \stackrel{*}{\asymp} A(0,j) \tag{5.6}$$

where the multiplicative error depends on δ, but not on j.

Combining (5.6) and Lemma 2.9, we see that for all $0 \le i \le m-1$, we have

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{\mathrm{i}(\delta,\gamma_{k+i})}{A(0,k+m)} = 0. \tag{5.7}$$

Observe that the γ_{k+i} here are precisely the components of σ_k. It turns out that the intersection numbers with the other curves in P_k (not just those in σ_k), are also controlled by $A(0,k+m)$. This is essentially the Weil-Petersson analogue of [BLMR16, Theorem 9.15].

Lemma 5.9. *For any $\alpha_k \in P_k$ we have*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{i(\delta,\alpha_k)}{A(0,k+m)} = 0.$$

Proof. By (5.7) it suffices to prove the lemma when $\alpha_k \in P_k^c$, for all k.

Let μ be any fixed marking and let Y_k be the component of the complement $S \setminus \sigma_k$ containing α_k.

Claim 5.10. There exists $I > 0$, depending only on $R(\mu)$ and δ so that $\mathrm{i}(\pi_Y(\delta),\alpha_k) \le I$.

Proof. Since δ and μ are a fixed curve and marking, we can assume that their projections to all subsurfaces are uniformly close. Let $Z_k \subset Y_k$ be any subsurface with $\alpha_k \pitchfork Z_k$, and observe that since Z_k is disjoint from the m consecutive curves in σ_k, Theorem 2.7 implies that it cannot be an annulus with core curve in the sequence $\{\gamma_i\}_i$.

By Corollary 5.4, at the point $r(s_k)$ the $2m-1$ curves $\gamma_{k-m+2},\dots,\gamma_{k+m}$ have length bounded independent of k, and hence $\mathrm{i}(\alpha_k,\gamma_j)$ is uniformly bounded for each $j = k-m+2,\dots,k+m$. Since these curves fill $S\setminus\gamma_{k+1}$, $\pi_{Z_k}(\gamma_j) \neq \emptyset$ for some $k-m+2 \le j \le k+m$, and hence $d_{Z_k}(\gamma_j,\alpha_k)$ is uniformly bounded. Thus, by the triangle inequality and (2.5) we have

$$d_{Z_k}(\alpha_k,\delta) \stackrel{+}{\asymp} d_{Z_k}(\gamma_j,\mu) \le R(\mu).$$

Since this holds for all subsurfaces $Z_k \subseteq Y_k$, [CR07, Corollary D] tells us that $\mathrm{i}(\pi_{Y_k}(\delta), \alpha_k)$ is uniformly bounded, as required. □

Every arc of $\pi_{Y_k}(\delta)$ comes from a pair of intersection points with curves in σ_k. Consequently, taking $\kappa(\delta)$ as the second paragraph of Theorem 2.8 we have

$$\mathrm{i}(\delta, \alpha) \leq I \sum_{d=k}^{k+m-1} \mathrm{i}(\delta, \gamma_d) \stackrel{*}{\asymp}_{\kappa(\delta)} I \sum_{d=k}^{k+m-1} A(0, d) \leq mIA(0, k+m-1).$$

Thus, setting $K = mI\kappa(\delta)$ the proof of lemma is complete. □

Next, we estimate the various terms $\ell_\delta(s_k, \alpha)$ for $\alpha \in P_k$.

Lemma 5.11. *Suppose $\{s_k\}_k$ is a sequence satisfying either (C1) or (C2). Then for k sufficiently large and $\alpha \in P_k$, we have*

$$\mathrm{tw}_\alpha(\delta, s_k) \stackrel{+}{\asymp} \mathrm{tw}_\alpha(\gamma_0, s_k) \stackrel{+}{\asymp} \begin{cases} e_k & \text{if } \alpha = \gamma_k \\ 0 & \alpha \neq \gamma_k \text{ or } \gamma_{k+1}. \end{cases}$$

If $\{s_k\}_k$ satisfies (C1), then for k sufficiently large, $\mathrm{tw}_{\gamma_{k+1}}(\delta, s_k) \stackrel{+}{\asymp} 0$.

Proof. By Theorem 2.7 and Proposition 3.1, $\{\gamma_k\}_k$ is a quasi-geodesic ray. Thus, for any fixed δ and j sufficiently large, Theorem 2.3 implies that $d_{\gamma_j}(\gamma_0, \delta) \stackrel{+}{\asymp} 0$. Since each $\alpha \in P_k$ is within distance 1 of γ_k, we also have $d_\alpha(\gamma_0, \delta) \stackrel{+}{\asymp} 0$ for all $\alpha \in P_k$, once k is sufficiently large.

Suppose $\{s_k\}_k$ satisfies (C1). The filling set of curves $\gamma_{k-m+1}, \ldots, \gamma_{k+m}$ have bounded length in $r(s_k)$. So, for all k sufficiently large and $\alpha \in P_k$

$$\mathrm{tw}_\alpha(\delta, s_k) \stackrel{+}{\asymp} \mathrm{tw}_\alpha(\gamma_0, s_k) \stackrel{+}{\asymp} \mathrm{diam}_\alpha(\gamma_0 \cup \gamma_{k-m+1} \cup \cdots \cup \gamma_{k+m}).$$

If $\alpha \in P_k^c$, then $\alpha \notin \{\gamma_j\}_j$, and so the term on the right is uniformly close to 0 by Theorem 2.7. If $\alpha = \gamma_j \neq \gamma_k$, then $j > k$, and the only curves in the set $\gamma_{k-m+1}, \ldots, \gamma_{k+m}$ which actually intersect γ_j nontrivially must have index *less* than j. In this case, Theorem 2.7 implies that the term on the right is also uniformly close to 0. When $\alpha = \gamma_k$, again appealing to Theorem 2.7, the right hand side is estimated (to bounded additive error) by

$$d_{\gamma_k}(\gamma_0, \gamma_{k+m}) \stackrel{+}{\asymp} e_k.$$

This proves the lemma when $\{s_k\}_k$ satisfies (C1). The proof when $\{s_k\}_k$ satisfies (C2) is nearly identical since the curves $\gamma_{k-m+2}, \ldots, \gamma_k, \gamma_{k+2}, \gamma_{k+m}$ have bounded length and fill $S - \gamma_{k+1}$, so the only curve whose twisting we can no longer estimate is γ_{k+1}. Since the conclusion of the lemma is silent regarding the twisting in this curve in case (C2), we are done. □

Proof of Theorem 5.7. In either case that $\{s_k\}_k$ satisfies (C1) or (C2), set $x_k = w_{s_k}(\gamma_k) + \mathrm{tw}_{\gamma_k}(\gamma_0, s_k)\ell_{\gamma_k}(s_k)$. Observe that $\ell_{\gamma_k}(s_k) \stackrel{*}{\asymp} 1$, so by (5.4)

$w_{s_k} \overset{*}{\asymp} 1$ (these estimates depend on ϵ in case (C1), but not k). On the other hand, from Lemma 5.11, for any curve δ and k sufficiently large we have

$$\mathrm{tw}_{\gamma_k}(\gamma_0, s_k) \overset{+}{\asymp} \mathrm{tw}_{\gamma_k}(\delta, s_k) \overset{+}{\asymp} e_k \to \infty$$

as $k \to \infty$. Consequently, we have

$$\frac{\ell_\delta(s_k, \gamma_k)}{x_k \mathrm{i}(\delta, \gamma_k)} = \frac{w_{s_k}(\gamma_k) + \mathrm{tw}_{\gamma_k}(\delta, s_k)\ell_{\gamma_k}(s_k)}{w_{s_k}(\gamma_k) + \mathrm{tw}_{\gamma_k}(\gamma_0, s_k)\ell_{\gamma_k}(s_k)} \to 1 \tag{5.8}$$

as $k \to \infty$. Now combining this with (5.6), for large k, we have

$$\ell_\delta(s_k, \gamma_k) \overset{*}{\asymp} x_k \mathrm{i}(\delta, \gamma_k) \overset{*}{\asymp} e_k \mathrm{i}(\delta, \gamma_k) \overset{*}{\asymp} A(0, k+m) \tag{5.9}$$

Now suppose that we are in case (C1) and $\alpha_k \in P_k$, but $\alpha_k \neq \gamma_k$. As for γ_k above, we have $\ell_{\alpha_k}(s_k) \overset{*}{\asymp} 1 \overset{*}{\asymp} w_{s_k}(\alpha_k)$ (with errors depending on ϵ, but not k). Combining this with (5.6) and Lemma 5.11, we have

$$\ell_\delta(s_k, \alpha_k) \overset{*}{\asymp} \mathrm{i}(\delta, \alpha_k).$$

Therefore, by (5.9) and Lemma 5.9, we have

$$\frac{\ell_\delta(s_k, \alpha_k)}{x_k i(\delta, \gamma_k)} \overset{*}{\asymp} \frac{i(\delta, \alpha_k)}{A(0, k+m)} \to 0 \tag{5.10}$$

as $k \to \infty$.

Combining Theorem 5.8 with Lemma 5.9, (5.8), and (5.10), for any δ we have

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \tfrac{\ell_\delta(s_k)}{x_k \mathrm{i}(\delta,\gamma_k)} = \lim_{k\to\infty} \tfrac{\ell_\delta(s_k,\gamma_k)}{x_k \mathrm{i}(\delta,\gamma_k)} + \tfrac{1}{x_k \mathrm{i}(\delta,\gamma_k)} \Big(\sum_{\substack{\alpha\in P_k \\ \alpha_k \neq \gamma_k}} \ell_\delta(s_k, \alpha) + O\Big(\sum_{\alpha \in P_k} \mathrm{i}(\delta, \alpha) \Big) \Big) = 1,$$

as required.

When $\{s_k\}_k$ satisfies (C2), x_k is defined as above, and we set

$$y_k = w_{s_k}(\gamma_{k+1}) + \mathrm{tw}_{\gamma_{k+1}}(\gamma_0, s_k)\ell_{\gamma_{k+1}}(s_k).$$

According to Corollary 5.4, $\ell_{\gamma_{k+1}}(s_k) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$, and so by (5.4) we have

$$w_{s_k}(\gamma_{k+1}) \to \infty$$

as $k \to \infty$. On the other hand, Lemma 5.11 ensures that for any curve δ and k sufficiently large, we have

$$\mathrm{tw}_{\gamma_{k+1}}(\gamma_0, s_k) \overset{+}{\asymp} \mathrm{tw}_{\gamma_{k+1}}(\delta, s_k).$$

Therefore,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{\ell_\delta(s_k, \gamma_{k+1})}{y_k \mathrm{i}(\delta, \gamma_{k+1})} = 1,$$

and combining this with (5.8) we have

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{\ell_\delta(s_k, \gamma_k) + \ell_\delta(s_k, \gamma_{k+1})}{x_k \mathrm{i}(\delta, \gamma_k) + y_k \mathrm{i}(\delta, \gamma_{k+1})} = 1.$$

Because the estimate (5.10) still holds for $\alpha_k \neq \gamma_k$ or γ_{k+1}, we can again apply Theorem 5.8 and Lemma 5.9 to deduce that for any curve δ we have

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{\ell_\delta(s_k)}{x_k \mathrm{i}(\delta,\gamma_k) + y_k \mathrm{i}(\delta,\gamma_{k+1})} = \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{\ell_\delta(s_k,\gamma_k) + \ell_\delta(s_k,\gamma_{k+1})}{x_k \mathrm{i}(\delta,\gamma_k) + y_k \mathrm{i}(\delta,\gamma_{k+1})} = 1,$$

completing the proof in case (C2), and hence in general. □

6. The uniquely ergodic case

Let $r : [0,\infty) \to \mathrm{Teich}(S)$ be a WP geodesic ray, and denote the forward ending lamination of r by ν. The following immediately implies Theorem 1.1 from the introduction.

Theorem 6.1. *Suppose that ν is uniquely ergodic, then the limit set of r is the point $[\bar{\nu}]$.*

Proof. The proof of the theorem closely follows Masur's proof of the analogous fact for Teicmüller geodesics [Mas82, Theorem 1]. Assuming $[\bar{\xi}]$ is any accumulation point of r, let $\{t_i\}_i$ be a sequence of times so that $r(t_i) \to [\bar{\xi}]$ as $i \to \infty$ in the Thurston compactification of Teichmüller space $\mathrm{Teich}(S) \cup \mathcal{PML}(S)$; see §2.4. According to the *Fundamental Lemma* of [FLP79, exposé 8], there exists a sequence $\{\bar{\mu}_i\}_i \subset \mathcal{ML}(S)$, such that

$$\mathrm{i}(\bar{\mu}_i, \delta) \leq \ell_\delta(r(t_i)),$$

for all simple closed curves δ, as well as a sequence of positive real numbers $\{b_i\}_i$, so that $b_i\bar{\mu}_i \to \bar{\xi} \in \mathcal{ML}(S)$ and $b_i \to 0$, as $i \to \infty$.

Let $\bar{\nu}$ be a transverse measure on ν. Since ν is uniquely ergodic, and hence minimal, there exists a sequence of Bers curves $\{\gamma_i\}_i$ and positive real numbers $\{c_i\}_i$, so that $c_i\gamma_i \to \bar{\nu} \in \mathcal{ML}(S)$ and $c_i \to 0$, as $i \to \infty$. Since the γ_i are Bers curves, by the inequality above there exists $C > 0$ so that

$$\mathrm{i}(\bar{\mu}_i, \gamma_i) \leq \ell_{\gamma_i}(r(t_i)) \leq C.$$

Consequently, by continuity of the intersection form, we have

$$\mathrm{i}(\bar{\xi}, \bar{\nu}) = \lim_{i\to\infty} \mathrm{i}(b_i\bar{\mu}_i, c_i\gamma_i) = \lim_{i\to\infty} b_i c_i \mathrm{i}(\bar{\mu}_i, \gamma_i) \leq C \lim_{i\to\infty} b_i c_i = 0,$$

and hence $\mathrm{i}(\bar{\xi}, \bar{\nu}) = 0$. Because ν is uniquely ergodic, [Mas82, Lemma 2] implies $\bar{\xi}$ is a multiple of $\bar{\nu}$, and therefore $[\bar{\xi}] = [\bar{\nu}]$. Since $[\bar{\xi}]$ was an arbitrary accumulation point of r in $\mathcal{PML}(S)$, the proof is complete. □

7. Appendix

In this appendix we provide the proofs of the results of §2.5 about sequences of curves. As we mentioned there, many of the proofs closely follow the ones in [BLMR16], while others have been streamlined since the writing of that paper. Here we mainly outline the proofs that are similar, incorporating the required changes, and otherwise provide the streamlined proofs.

7.1. **Subsurface coefficient estimates.** In the next Lemma, B_0 is the constant from Theorem 2.4.

Lemma 7.1. *Fix any $B > B_0$, and suppose $\{\delta_k\}_{k=0}^{\omega}$ is any (finite or infinite) sequence of simple closed curves with $\omega \leq \infty$, with the property that $d_{\delta_k}(\delta_{k-1}, \delta_{k+1}) \geq 3B$ for all $k \geq 2$. Then for all $0 \leq i < k < j$,*

$$|d_{\delta_k}(\delta_i, \delta_j) - d_{\delta_k}(\delta_{k-1,}, \delta_{k+1})| \leq 2B_0.$$

Proof. To simplify the notation, write $d_k(i,j) = d_{\delta_k}(\delta_i, \delta_j)$. The proof is by induction on $n = j - i$. The base case is $n = 2$, in which case $i = k-1$, $j = k+1$, and the conclusion follows immediately from the hypothesis.

Suppose the statement holds for all $i < k < j$ with $j - i \leq n$, and we prove it for $n+1$. To that end, suppose $1 \leq i < k < j$ are such that $j - i = n+1$. We claim that $d_k(i, k-1) \leq B_0$. To see this, note that if $i = k-1$, then this is obvious. Otherwise, $i < k-1 < k$ and $k - i \leq n$, so by induction

$$d_{k-1}(i,k) \geq e_k \geq 3B - 2B_0 > B_0.$$

and Theorem 2.4 implies $d_k(i, k-1) \leq B_0$. By similar reasoning, we have that $d_k(k+1, j) \leq B_0$, and so by the triangle inequality

$$|d_k(i,j) - d_k(k-1, k+1)| \leq d_k(i, k-1) + d_k(j, k+1) \leq 2B_0. \qquad \square$$

Set $B = \max\{3, B_0 + 1, G_0\}$, where G_0 is the constant from Theorem 2.3 for a geodesic in $\mathcal{C}(S)$. Set $E_0 = 3B + 4$, and for the remainder of this subsection, assume the sequence $\Gamma(\mathcal{E}) = \{\gamma_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$, satisfies $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ from Definition 2.5 where $\mathcal{E} = \{e_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$, $e_k \geq a e_{k-1}$ for some $a \geq 1$ and all k, and $e_0 \geq E_0$ (and hence $e_k \geq E_0$ for all k).

Lemma 7.2. *For all $i < k < j$ such that $k - i, j - k \in \mathbb{M}$, the monoid generated by $\{m, m+1\}$ (e.g. if $k - i, j - k \geq m^2 - 1$), we have*

$$|d_{\gamma_k}(\gamma_i, \gamma_j) - e_k| \leq 2B_0 + 4$$

Consequently, if $i < k$ and $k - i \in \mathbb{M}$, then $i(\gamma_i, \gamma_k) > 0$.

Proof. As in the previous proof, we write $d_k(i,j) = d_{\gamma_k}(\gamma_i, \gamma_j)$, and also write $\mathrm{i}(i,j) = \mathrm{i}(\gamma_i, \gamma_j)$ and $\pi_i(j) = \pi_{\gamma_i}(\gamma_j)$.

We make a few observations from Definition 2.5. First, $\mathrm{i}(j, j+1) = 0$ for all j, and hence if $\pi_k(j), \pi_k(j+1) \neq \emptyset$ for some k, then $d_k(j, j+1) = 1$. Second, for all k, $\mathrm{i}(k, k+m), \mathrm{i}(k, k+m+1) \neq 0$. Consequently, $\pi_k(j) \neq \emptyset$ for all j, k with $|j - k| \in \{m, m+1\}$. Finally, observe that $|d_k(k-m, k+m) - e_k| \leq 2$. Thus, if $i < k < j$ and $k - i, j - k \in \{m, m+1\}$, by the triangle inequality

$$|d_k(i,j) - e_k| \leq 4. \tag{7.1}$$

Now, for any sequence of integers $\{k_j\}_j$ that increase by m or $m+1$ (i.e. $k_{j+1} - k_j \in \{m, m+1\}$ for all j), the sequence $\{\gamma_{k_j}\}_j$ has $d_{k_j}(k_{j-1}, k_{j+1}) \geq 3B$ by (7.1), and hence satisfies the assumption of Lemma 7.1. Consequently, if $i < \ell < j$, then

$$|d_{k_\ell}(k_i, k_j) - e_{k_\ell}| \leq 2B_0 + 4.$$

Therefore, if $i < k < j$ and $k - i, j - k \in \mathbb{M}$, the monoid generated by $\{m, m+1\}$, then

$$|d_k(i,j) - e_k| \leq 2B_0 + 4.$$

Simple arithmetic shows that $k - i, j - k \geq m^2 - 1$ implies $k - i, j - k \in \mathbb{M}$, and this completes the proof. □

Lemma 7.3. *The map $k \mapsto \gamma_k$ is a 1–Lipschitz, (K, C)–quasi-geodesic, where $K = C = 2m^2 + 2m - 1$.*

Proof. First, suppose $i < j$ with $j - i \geq 2m^2 + 2m - 1$. Then by Lemma 7.2 for each $k = i + m^2, i + m^2 + 1, \ldots, i + m^2 + 2m - 1$, we have

$$d_{\gamma_k}(\gamma_i, \gamma_j) \geq e_k - 2B_0 - 4 \geq B \geq 3. \tag{7.2}$$

The curves $\gamma_{i+m^2}, \ldots, \gamma_{i+m^2+2m-1}$ fill S. By (7.2), any curve that intersects one of these $2m$ curves must intersect one of γ_i or γ_j, and thus γ_i, γ_j fill S

Next, suppose $i < j$ and write $j = i + q(2m^2 + 2m - 1) + r$, where q, r are nonnegative integers with $0 \leq r < 2m^2 + 2m - 1$. Set $\delta_k = \gamma_{i+k(2m^2+2m-1)}$, for $k = 0, \ldots, q-1$, and $\delta_q = \gamma_j$. Then

$$\gamma_i = \delta_0, \delta_1, \ldots, \delta_{q-1}, \delta_q = \gamma_j$$

is a sequence in $\mathcal{C}(S)$ with the property that any two distinct curves fill, and by (7.2), for all $0 < k < q$ we have

$$d_{\delta_k}(\gamma_i, \gamma_j) \geq B \geq G_0.$$

So, by Theorem 2.3, a geodesic from γ_i to γ_j must have a vertex disjoint from δ_k, for each $k = 0, \ldots, q$. Since any two $\delta_k, \delta_{k'}$ fill S, no curve can be disjoint from more than one of these, and hence the geodesic must contain at least $q + 1$ vertices, so

$$d(\gamma_i, \gamma_j) \geq q = \frac{j - i - r}{2m^2 + 2m - 1} \geq \frac{1}{K}(j - i - C)$$

where $K = 2m^2 + 2m - 1$ and $C = 2m^2 + 2m - 1$. Since this inequality trivially holds if $j - i < C$ and $i < j$, the required lower bound follows. Since γ_k, γ_{k+1} are disjoint, the map is 1–Lipschitz, and the upper bound for a (K, C)-quasi-geodesic are immediate. □

For each $k \geq 0$, set $\mu_k = \{\gamma_k, \ldots, \gamma_{k+2m-1}\}$.

Lemma 7.4. *There exists $M > 0$ such that for any subsurface $W \subset S$ which is neither S nor an annulus corresponding to some γ_k, we have*

$$d_W(\mu_i, \mu_j) \leq M$$

for all i, j.

Proof. First, let $\mu'_k = \{\gamma_k, \ldots, \gamma_{k+2m-2}, \gamma'_{k+2m-1}\}$ where γ'_{k+2m-1} is as in Definition 2.5. From the assumptions, μ_k, μ'_{k+1} have uniformly bounded intersection number (bounded by $m^2 b_2$, for example). Consequently, there exists $M_0 > 0$ such that for any subsurface W and any k, we have

$$d_W(\mu_k, \mu'_{k+1}) \leq M_0.$$

Next, observe that μ'_{k+1} and μ_{k+1} differ by Dehn twisting γ'_{k+2m} about γ_{k+m} (which has zero intersection number with all curves in μ'_{k+1} except γ'_{k+2m}). Therefore, there exists another constant $M_1 > 0$ so that as long as W is not the annulus with core γ_{k+m}, we have

$$d_W(\mu'_{k+1}, \mu_{k+1}) \leq M_1.$$

Indeed, for any such W, $\pi_W(\mu'_{k+1}) \cap \pi_W(\mu_{k+1}) \neq \emptyset$, and so we may take M_1 to be at most the sum of the diameters of $\pi_W(\mu'_{k+1})$ and $\pi_W(\mu'_{k+1})$.

From these two inequalities, we see that for any subsurface W which is not the annulus with core γ_{k+m}, the triangle inequality implies

$$d_W(\mu_k, \mu_{k+1}) \leq M_0 + M_1.$$

From this it follows that for any $D > 0$ and $|j - i| \leq D$,

$$d_W(\gamma_i, \gamma_j) \leq D(M_0 + M_1) \tag{7.3}$$

whenever W is not an annulus with core curve γ_k, for any k.

Finally, suppose W is any subsurface which is not S and not an annulus with core curve γ_k, for some k. By Lemma 7.3, there is a uniform bound on the number of vertices of the (K, C)–quasi-geodesic $k \mapsto \gamma_k$ that are within distance 1 of ∂W. Consequently, there exists $D_0 > 0$ (independent of W) and i_0 so that if $k \notin [i_0, i_0 + D_0]$, then $\pi_W(\gamma_k) \neq \emptyset$. By Theorem 2.3, there exists $G = G(K, C)$ so that the projection of both sequences $\{\gamma_k\}_{k=1}^{i_0}$ and $\{\gamma_k\}_{k=i_0+D_0}$ to W have diameter at most G. Combining this with (7.3) and setting $M = 2G + D_0(M_0 + M_1)$, we have

$$\operatorname{diam}_W(\{\gamma_k\}_{k=1}^{\infty}) \leq 2G + D_0(M_0 + M_1) = M.$$

Since M is independent of W, this completes the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 2.7. The fact that $\{\gamma_k\}_k$ is a 1–Lipschitz (K, C)–quasi-geodesic is Lemma 7.3. By Klarreich's work [Kla, Theorem 4.1]) describing the Gromov boundary of the curve complex, it follows that there exists an ending lamination ν, so that any accumulation point of $\{\gamma_k\}_k$ in $\mathcal{PML}(S)$ is supported on ν.

For any subsurface W, $\pi_W(\nu) \subseteq \pi_W(\gamma_k)$, and consequently the equations on the left of (2.4) and (2.5) follow from Lemmas 7.2 and Lemma 7.4, respectively, setting $R = \max\{M, 2B_0 + 4\}$. For any marking μ, the pairwise intersection between curves in μ and in μ_0 are bounded by some finite number, and hence $d_W(\mu, \mu_0)$ is uniformly bounded by some constant $D > 0$, independent of W. Setting $R(\mu) = R + D$, the equations on the right-hand side of (2.4) and (2.5) then follow from those on the left-hand side, together with the triangle inequality. □

7.2. **Intersection number estimates.** We now assume that $\mathcal{E} = \{e_k\}_k$ grows exponentially, with $e_k \geq ae_{k-1}$ for some $a > 1$ and all k. The aim is to estimate intersection numbers in terms of the numbers $A(i, k)$ defined in (2.6). We begin with the upper bound.

Lemma 7.5. *If $\Gamma(\mathcal{E}) = \{\gamma_k\}_k$ satisfies $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{E})$ with $e_k \geq ae_{k-1}$ for some $a > 1$, then there exists $\kappa > 0$ such that*

$$i(\gamma_i, \gamma_k) \leq \kappa A(i, k).$$

Moreover, we may take κ to be decreasing as a function of a.

Sketch of proof. The proof is a rather complicated induction, but is essentially identical to the proof of Proposition 5.5 from [BLMR16]. We sketch the proof for completeness.

We first recall from [FLP79, exposé 4], that for any simple closed curves β, δ, δ' and integer e, we have

$$\left|\mathrm{i}(D_\beta^e(\delta'), \delta) - |e|\mathrm{i}(\delta', \beta)\mathrm{i}(\delta, \beta)\right| \leq \mathrm{i}(\delta, \delta'). \tag{7.4}$$

Since $\gamma_{k+m} = D_{\gamma_k}^{e_k}(\gamma'_{k+m})$ and $\mathrm{i}(\gamma'_{k+m}, \gamma_k) = b$, we can apply this to estimate $\mathrm{i}(\gamma_i, \gamma_{k+m})$ to obtain

$$\left|\mathrm{i}(\gamma_i, \gamma_{k+m}) - be_k\mathrm{i}(\gamma_i, \gamma_k)\right| \leq \mathrm{i}(\gamma_i, \gamma'_{k+m}).$$

The right-hand side can be bounded as follows. Since the curves $\gamma_{k-m}, \ldots, \gamma_{k+m-1}$ fill S, these cut any simple closed curve δ into N arcs, where

$$N = \sum_{j=k-m}^{k+m-1} \mathrm{i}(\delta, \gamma_j).$$

Doing this for each of γ'_{k+m} and γ_i, any pair of resulting arcs intersect at most once in each complementary disk and at most twice in each once-punctured complementary disk. On the other hand, the assumption on intersection numbers for γ'_{k+m} implies that

$$\sum_{j=k-m}^{k+m-1} \mathrm{i}(\gamma_j, \gamma'_{k+m}) \leq (m+1)b'.$$

Consequently, setting $B = 2(m+1)b'$, we have

$$\left|\mathrm{i}(\gamma_i, \gamma_{k+m}) - be_k\mathrm{i}(\gamma_i, \gamma_k)\right| \leq B \sum_{j=k-m}^{k+m-1} \mathrm{i}(\gamma_i, \gamma_j), \tag{7.5}$$

and hence

$$\mathrm{i}(\gamma_i, \gamma_{k+m}) \leq be_k\mathrm{i}(\gamma_i, \gamma_k) + B \sum_{j=k-m}^{k+m-1} \mathrm{i}(\gamma_i, \gamma_j).$$

The goal is to show that $\mathrm{i}(\gamma_i, \gamma_{k+m}) \leq \kappa A(i, k+m)$ for some $\kappa > 0$. The proof is by induction on $(k+m) - i$, and the constant κ is actually a limit of an increasing sequence of constants $K(1) < K(2) < K(3) < \ldots$. To see what these should be, we assume by induction that $\mathrm{i}(\gamma_i, \gamma_j) \leq K(j-i)A(i, j)$

for all $i < j$ with $j - i < k + m$, then dividing both sides of the inequality above by $A(i, k + m)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\mathrm{i}(\gamma_i, \gamma_{k+m})}{A(i,k+m)} &\leq \frac{be_k \mathrm{i}(\gamma_i, \gamma_k)}{A(i,k+m)} + B \sum_{j=k-m}^{k+m-1} \frac{\mathrm{i}(\gamma_i, \gamma_j)}{A(i,k+m)} \\
&\leq K(k-i)\frac{be_k A(i,k)}{A(i,k+m)} + B \sum_{j=k-m}^{k+m-1} K(j-i)\frac{A(i,j)}{A(i,k+m)} \\
&\leq K(k+m-1-i)\Big(1 + B \sum_{j=k-m}^{k+m-1} a^{-\lfloor \frac{k-i}{m} \rfloor}\Big) \\
&= K((k+m-i)-1)(1 + 2mBa^{-\lfloor \frac{k-i}{m} \rfloor})
\end{aligned}$$

The right-hand suggests the recursive/inductive definition

$$K(k+m-i) := K((k+m-i)-1)(1 + 2mBa^{-\lfloor \frac{k-i}{m} \rfloor}).$$

(Note that the right-hand side depends only on the difference $k - i$ and not on i and k independently). For $a > 1$, one shows (using a comparison with a geometric series, after taking logarithms) that $K(j)$ so defined is bounded, and since it is increasing, it converges to a constant $\kappa > 0$. Since $K(j) < \kappa$ for all j, the inequality above proves the lemma. See [BLMR16] for the details. □

Since we are assuming fewer nonzero intersection numbers in the current work than in [BLMR16], the lower bounds we obtain are weaker, and the proof is slightly more complicated than in [BLMR16]. Fortunately, the weaker estimates suffice for our purposes.

Lemma 7.6. *If $e_k \geq ae_{k-1}$ for $a > 1$ sufficiently large and all k, then there exists $\kappa' > 0$ such that*

$$i(\gamma_i, \gamma_k) \geq \kappa' A(i,k)$$

whenever

(1) $0 \leq i \leq 2m - 1$ and $k \geq i + m^2 + m - 1$, or
(2) $k - i \geq 2m$ and $i \equiv k \bmod m$

Proof. Fix some constant $a_0 > 1$ and assume to begin that $e_k \geq a_0 e_{k-1}$, and let $\kappa > 0$ be the constant from Lemma 7.5. We will eventually take a larger $a > a_0$, but we observe that upper bound on intersection numbers from Lemma 7.5 remains valid with this choice of κ.

Now, recalling that $A(i, k+m) = be_k A(i,k)$, dividing (7.5) by $A(i, k+m)$, we have

$$\frac{\mathrm{i}(\gamma_i, \gamma_{k+m})}{A(i,k+m)} \geq \frac{\mathrm{i}(\gamma_i, \gamma_k)}{A(i,k)} - B \sum_{j=k-m}^{k+m-1} \frac{\mathrm{i}(\gamma_i, \gamma_j)}{A(i,k+m)}.$$

Combining this with Lemmas 2.9 and 7.5 we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathrm{i}(\gamma_i,\gamma_{k+m})}{A(i,k+m)} &\geq \frac{\mathrm{i}(\gamma_i,\gamma_k)}{A(i,k)} - \kappa B \sum_{j=k-m}^{k+m-1} \frac{A(i,j)}{A(i,k+m)} \\ &\geq \frac{\mathrm{i}(\gamma_i,\gamma_k)}{A(i,k)} - 2m\kappa B a^{-\lfloor \frac{k-i}{m} \rfloor}\end{aligned}$$

Recursively substituting, we see that for any $n \geq 0$ such that $i < k - nm$,

$$\frac{\mathrm{i}(\gamma_i,\gamma_{k+m})}{A(i,k+m)} \geq \frac{\mathrm{i}(\gamma_i,\gamma_{k-nm})}{A(i,k-nm)} - 2m\kappa B \sum_{s=0}^{n} a^{-\lfloor \frac{k-i}{m} \rfloor + s} \tag{7.6}$$

In this situation, taking $a > a_0 > 1$ sufficiently large, we can make the term

$$2m\kappa B \sum_{s=0}^{n} a^{-\lfloor \frac{k-i}{m} \rfloor + s}$$

as small as we like, independent of n (since this is a partial sum of a geometric series). Specifically, we choose $a > a_0 > 1$ large enough so that for all $k - i \geq m$ and $n \geq 0$, the sum is bounded above by κ', where

$$\kappa' = \frac{1}{2} \min \Big\{ \frac{1}{A(i,j)} \mid 0 \leq i \leq 2m-1 \text{ and } i < j \leq m^2 + 3m - 2 \Big\}.$$

Now, suppose $0 \leq i \leq 2m-1$ and $k \geq i + m^2 + m - 1$, and write $k = j + m$ (so $j \geq i + m^2 - 1$). Let $n \geq 0$ be such that

$$i + m^2 - 1 \leq j - nm \leq m^2 + 3m - 2,$$

which is possible since $i + m^2 - 1 \leq m^2 + 2m - 2$. By Lemma 7.2, $\mathrm{i}(\gamma_i, \gamma_{j-nm}) \geq 1$, and therefore

$$\frac{\mathrm{i}(\gamma_i,\gamma_{j+m})}{A(i,j+m)} \geq \frac{\mathrm{i}(\gamma_i,\gamma_{j-nm})}{A(i,j-nm)} - 2m\kappa B \sum_{s=0}^{n} a^{-\lfloor \frac{j-i}{m} \rfloor + s} \geq 2\kappa' - \kappa' = \kappa'.$$

That is, $\mathrm{i}(\gamma_i, \gamma_k) \geq \kappa' A(i,k)$, proving part (i).

Next, let k, i be any positive integers such that $k - i \geq 2m$ and $i \equiv k \bmod m$. Write $k = j + m$ and let $n \geq 0$ be such that $j - nm = i + m$. Then by (7.6) we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathrm{i}(\gamma_i,\gamma_{j+m})}{A(i,j+m)} &\geq \frac{\mathrm{i}(\gamma_i,\gamma_{j-nm})}{A(i,j-nm)} - 2m\kappa B \sum_{s=0}^{n} a^{-\lfloor \frac{j-i}{m} \rfloor + s} \\ &= \frac{\mathrm{i}(\gamma_i,\gamma_{i+m})}{1} - \kappa' \geq 2\kappa' - \kappa' = \kappa'\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows from the fact that $\kappa' \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $\mathrm{i}(\gamma_i, \gamma_{i+m}) = b \geq 1$. This proves (ii), and completes the proof of the lemma. □

Proof of Theorem 2.8. The first paragraph of the theorem follows immediately from Lemmas 7.5 and 7.6, setting $\kappa_0 = \max\{\kappa, \frac{1}{\kappa'}\}$. The second paragraph is the next lemma. □

Lemma 7.7. *For any curve δ, there exists $\kappa(\delta) > 0$ and $N(\delta) \in \mathbb{Z}$ so that for all $k \geq N(\delta)$, we have*

$$i(\delta, \gamma_k) \stackrel{*}{\asymp}_{\kappa(\delta)} A(0,k).$$

We only sketch the proof since this is exactly the same statement and proof as in Lemma 5.11 from [BLMR16].

Sketch of proof. The idea is that from the estimates in Lemma 7.5 and 7.6, we have some $\kappa_0, n_0 > 0$ so that for all $0 \leq i \leq 2m-1$ and $k \geq n_0$,

$$\mathrm{i}(\gamma_i, \gamma_k) \stackrel{*}{\asymp}_{\kappa_0} A(0,k).$$

Since $\mu_0 = \gamma_0 \cup \ldots \cup \gamma_{2m-1}$ fills S, this means that the set of laminations $\{\frac{\gamma_k}{A(0,k)}\}_{k \geq n_0} \subset \mathcal{ML}(S)$ form a compact subset of $\mathcal{ML}(S)$. By Theorem 2.8, this sequence can only accumulate on points of $\mathcal{ML}(S)$ supported on ν. So, for any curve δ, there is a compact neighborhood of the accumulation points and a number $\kappa(\delta) > 0$ on which intersection number with δ lies in the interval $\left[\frac{1}{\kappa(\delta)}, \kappa(\delta)\right]$. But then for k sufficiently large, $\frac{\gamma_k}{A(0,k)}$ is in this neighborhood and hence

$$\frac{\mathrm{i}(\delta, \gamma_k)}{A(0,k)} = \Big(\delta, \frac{\gamma_k}{A(0,k)}\Big) \stackrel{*}{\asymp}_{\kappa(\delta)} 1$$

as required. □

7.3. **Convergence in $\mathcal{ML}(S)$.** Lemma 7.7, together with (7.4), are the key ingredients in the proof of the following, which is identical to Lemma 5.13 from [BLMR16].

Proposition 7.8. *For each $h = 0, \ldots, m-1$,*

$$\lim_{i \to \infty} \frac{\gamma_{h+im}}{A(0, h+im)} = \bar{\nu}^h$$

in $\mathcal{ML}(S)$, where $\bar{\nu}^h$ is a measure supported on ν.

Sketch of proof. Applying (7.4) to estimate $\mathrm{i}(\gamma_{k+m}, \delta)$ using the fact that $\gamma_{k+m} = D_{\gamma_k}^{e_k}(\gamma'_{k+m})$, and applying Lemma 7.7 we may argue as in the proof of Lemma 7.5 we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathrm{i}(\gamma_{k+m}, \delta) - be_k \mathrm{i}(\gamma_k, \delta)| &\leq \mathrm{i}(\gamma'_{k+m}, \delta) \leq B \sum_{l=k-m}^{k+m-1} \mathrm{i}(\gamma_l, \delta) \\ &\leq B\kappa(\delta) \sum_{l=k-m}^{k+m-1} A(0,l). \end{aligned}$$

Dividing both side by $A(0, k+m)$ and applying Lemma 2.9 this implies

$$\left| \mathrm{i}\Big(\frac{\gamma_{k+m}}{A(0,k+m)}, \delta\Big) - \mathrm{i}\Big(\frac{\gamma_k}{A(0,k)}, \delta\Big) \right| \leq 2mB\kappa(\delta) a^{-\lfloor \frac{k}{m} \rfloor}.$$

From this and a geometric series argument, we deduce that for all $h = 0, \dots, m-1$, the sequence $\left\{ \mathrm{i}\left(\frac{\gamma_{h+im}}{A(0,h+im)}, \delta \right) \right\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$ is a Cauchy sequence of real numbers, and hence converges. By Lemma 7.7, the limit is nonzero, and since this is true for every simple closed curve δ, the sequence $\left\{ \frac{\gamma_{h+im}}{A(0,h+im)} \right\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$ converges to some $\bar{\nu}^h \in \mathcal{ML}(S)$, supported on ν by Theorem 2.7. □

The next lemma is the analog of Theorem 6.1 from [BLMR16]. The proof is essentially the same, but since the required intersection number estimates are weaker here, we sketch the proof nonetheless.

Lemma 7.9. *For each $h, h' \in \{0, \dots, m-1\}$ with $h \neq h'$, we have*

$$\lim_{i \to \infty} \frac{i(\gamma_{h+im}, \bar{\nu}^h)}{i(\gamma_{h+im}, \bar{\nu}^{h'})} = \infty.$$

Consequently, $\bar{\nu}^h$ is not absolutely continuous with respect to $\bar{\nu}^{h'}$.

Sketch of Proof. As in [BLMR16], it clearly suffices to prove that for i sufficiently large,

$$\mathrm{i}(\gamma_h, \gamma_{h+(i+1)m}) \mathrm{i}(\gamma_{h+im}, \bar{\nu}^h) \stackrel{*}{\asymp} 1$$

and

$$\lim_{i \to \infty} \mathrm{i}(\gamma_h, \gamma_{h+(i+1)m}) \mathrm{i}(\gamma_{h+im}, \bar{\nu}^{h'}) = 0.$$

Appealing to Proposition 7.8 to estimate $\bar{\nu}^h$ by $\frac{\gamma_{h+km}}{A(0,h+km)}$ for large $k \gg i$, and Theorem 2.8, we have

$$\mathrm{i}(\gamma_0, \gamma_{h+(i+1)m}) \mathrm{i}(\gamma_{h+im}, \bar{\nu}^h) \stackrel{*}{\asymp} \frac{A(0,h+(i+1)m) A(h+im,h+km)}{A(0,h+km)} = 1$$

The last equality here follows from a simple calculation using the definition (2.6) of $A(i,j)$ (see the proof of [BLMR16, Theorem 6.1] for details). The multiplicative error here can be made arbitrarily close to κ_0^2 (taking k sufficiently large).

Similarly, we estimate $\bar{\nu}^{h'} = \frac{\gamma_{h'+km}}{A(0,h'+km)}$ and apply Theorem 2.8 to obtain

$$\mathrm{i}(\gamma_0, \gamma_{h+(i+1)m}) \mathrm{i}(\gamma_{h+im}, \bar{\nu}^{h'}) \stackrel{*}{\prec} \frac{A(0,h+(i+1)m) A(h+im,h'+km)}{A(0,h'+km)} \stackrel{*}{\prec} a^{-i}$$

The first multiplicative error can be made arbitrarily close to κ_0^2 (again taking k sufficiently large). The second bound follows from a calculation and Lemma 2.9, with multiplicative error depending only on whether $h > h'$ or $h' > h$ (see [BLMR16] for details). □

Proof of Theorem 2.10. All that remains is to prove that $\bar{\nu}^0, \dots, \bar{\nu}^{m-1}$ are ergodic measures. At this point, the proof is identical to the proof of the analogous statement Theorem 6.7 from [BLMR16], appealing to the facts proved so far. This proof involves a detailed analysis of Teichmüller geodesics, drawing specifically on results of Lenzhen-Masur [LM10] and the fourth author [Raf05]. As this would take us too far afield of the current discussion, we refer the reader to that paper for the details. □

References

[Beh06] Jason A. Behrstock, *Asymptotic geometry of the mapping class group and Teichmüller space*, Geom. Topol. **10** (2006), 1523–1578.

[BLMR16] Jeffrey Brock, Christopher Leininger, Babak Modami, and Kasra Rafi, *Limit sets of Teicmüller geodesics with minimal non-uniquely vertical laminations, II*, arXiv:1601.03368 (2016).

[BM15] Jeffrey Brock and Babak Modami, *Recurrent Weil-Petersson geodesic rays with non-uniquely ergodic ending laminations*, Geom. Topol. **19** (2015), no. 6, 3565–3601.

[BMM10] Jeffrey Brock, Howard Masur, and Yair Minsky, *Asymptotics of Weil-Petersson geodesics. I. Ending laminations, recurrence, and flows*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **19** (2010), no. 5, 1229–1257.

[BMM11] ———, *Asymptotics of Weil-Petersson geodesics II: bounded geometry and unbounded entropy*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **21** (2011), no. 4, 820–850.

[Bon01] Francis Bonahon, *Geodesic laminations on surfaces*, Laminations and foliations in dynamics, geometry and topology (Stony Brook, NY, 1998), Contemp. Math., vol. 269, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2001, pp. 1–37.

[Bro03] Jeffrey F. Brock, *The Weil-Petersson metric and volumes of 3-dimensional hyperbolic convex cores*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **16** (2003), no. 3, 495–535.

[Bro05] ———, *The Weil-Petersson visual sphere*, Geom. Dedicata **115** (2005), 1–18.

[Bus10] Peter Buser, *Geometry and spectra of compact Riemann surfaces*, Modern Birkhäuser Classics, Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 2010, Reprint of the 1992 edition.

[CMW] Jon Chaika, Howard Masur, and Michael Wolf, *Limits in PMF of Teichmüller geodesics*, arXiv:1406.0564.

[CR07] Young-Eun Choi and Kasra Rafi, *Comparison between Teichmüller and Lipschitz metrics*, J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2) **76** (2007), no. 3, 739–756.

[CRS08] Young-Eun Choi, Kasra Rafi, and Caroline Series, *Lines of minima and Teichmüller geodesics*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **18** (2008), no. 3, 698–754.

[DW03] Georgios Daskalopoulos and Richard Wentworth, *Classification of Weil-Petersson isometries*, Amer. J. Math. **125** (2003), no. 4, 941–975.

[FLP79] A. Fathi, F. Laudenbach, and V. Poenaru, *Travaux de Thurston sur les surfaces*, Astérisque No. 66-67 (1979), 1–286.

[Ker80] Steven P. Kerckhoff, *The asymptotic geometry of Teichmüller space*, Topology **19** (1980), no. 1, 23–41.

[Kla] Erica Klarreich, *The boundary at infinity of the curve complex*, preprint, 1999.

[Len08] Anna Lenzhen, *Teichmüller geodesics that do not have a limit in $\mathcal{PMF}$*, Geom. Topol. **12** (2008), no. 1, 177–197. MR 2377248

[LLR] Christopher Leininger, Anna Lenzhen, and Kasra Rafi, *Limit sets of Teichmüller geodesics with minimal non-uniquely ergodic vertical foliation*, J. reine angew. Math, to appear. arXiv: 1312.2305.

[LM10] Anna Lenzhen and Howard Masur, *Criteria for the divergence of pairs of Teichmüller geodesics*, Geom. Dedicata **144** (2010), 191–210.

[LMR16] Anna Lenzhen, Babak Modami, and Kasra Rafi, *Two-dimensional limit sets of teichmueller geodesics*, arXiv:1608.07945 (2016).

[Man13] Johanna Mangahas, *A recipe for short-word pseudo-Anosovs*, Amer. J. Math. **135** (2013), no. 4, 1087–1116.

[Mas75] H.A. Masur, *On a class of geodesics in Teichmüller space*, Ann. of Math. (2) **102** (1975), no. 2, 205–221.

[Mas82] Howard Masur, *Two boundaries of Teichmüller space*, Duke Math. J. **49** (1982), no. 1, 183–190.

[MM99] Howard A. Masur and Yair N. Minsky, *Geometry of the complex of curves. I. Hyperbolicity*, Invent. Math. **138** (1999), no. 1, 103–149.

[MM00] H. A. Masur and Y. N. Minsky, *Geometry of the complex of curves. II. Hierarchical structure*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **10** (2000), no. 4, 902–974.

[Mod15] Babak Modami, *Prescribing the behavior of Weil–Petersson geodesics in the moduli space of Riemann surfaces*, J. Topol. Anal. **7** (2015), no. 4, 543–676.

[PH92] R. C. Penner and J. L. Harer, *Combinatorics of train tracks*, Annals of Mathematics Studies, vol. 125, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1992.

[Raf05] Kasra Rafi, *A characterization of short curves of a Teichmüller geodesic*, Geom. Topol. **9** (2005), 179–202.

[Thu88] William P. Thurston, *On the geometry and dynamics of diffeomorphisms of surfaces*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **19** (1988), no. 2, 417–431. MR 956596

[Wol75] Scott Wolpert, *Noncompleteness of the Weil-Petersson metric for Teichmüller space*, Pacific J. Math. **61** (1975), no. 2, 573–577. MR 0422692

[Wol03] Scott A. Wolpert, *Geometry of the Weil-Petersson completion of Teichmüller space*, Surveys in differential geometry, Vol. VIII (Boston, MA, 2002), Surv. Differ. Geom., VIII, Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2003, pp. 357–393.

[Wol08] ———, *Behavior of geodesic-length functions on Teichmüller space*, J. Differential Geom. **79** (2008), no. 2, 277–334.

[Wol10] ———, *Families of Riemann surfaces and Weil-Petersson geometry*, CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics, vol. 113, Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC, 2010.

Department of Mathematics, Brown University, Providence, RI,
E-mail address: brock@math.brown.edu

Department of Mathematics, University of Illinois, 1409 W Green ST, Urbana, IL
E-mail address: clein@math.uiuc.edu

Department of Mathematics, Yale University, 10 Hillhouse Ave, New Haven, CT
E-mail address: babak.modami@yale.edu

Department of Mathematics, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON
E-mail address: rafi@math.toronto.edu